

THE
Safe Religion.
 OR THREE
DISPUTATIONS
 For the Reformed
CATHOLIKE RELIGION,
 AGAINST
POPERY.

Proving that Popery is against the Holy Scriptures, the Unity of the Catholike Church, the consent of the Antient Doctors, the plainest Reason, and common judgment of sense it self.

By *Richard Baxter.*

Contra Rationem, nemo sobrius:

Contra Scripturas, nemo Christianus:

Contra Ecclesiam, nemo Pacificus,

Senserit. August. de Trinit. l. 4. c. 6. fine.

London Printed, by Abraham Miller, for Thomas Underhill at the Anchor and Bible in Pauls Church-yard, and Francis Tyton at the three Daggers in Fleet-street, 1657.

THE
Safe Religion.

OR THREE
DISPUTATIONS

For the Defense
CATHOLICKES
AGAINST
POPEY.

Proving that Popes are not the Holy Spirit
Princes, the Catholic
Church, the Nations
The World, Reason, and
Conscience, but only men.



By Rich. Baxter.

Centur. Religion, anno 1656.
Centur. Religion, anno 1657.
Centur. Religion, anno 1658.
Centur. Religion, anno 1659.

Printed at the University of Oxford, by J. Streater, Printer to the University.
1656.



TO THE
Protestant Reader.



When the motion was first made for the Publishing of these Papers, it seemed to me to be as the Casting of water into the Sea; so great is the Number of the Learned Writings of Protestant Divines against the Papists (which will never be well answered) that the most elaborate addition may seem superfluous; much more these hasty Disputations prepared but for an exercise which is the Recreation of a few Countrey-Ministers at a monthly meeting, when they ease themselves of their ordinary work. But upon further consideration, I saw it was, The Casting of water upon a threatening fire, which the Sea it self doth but restrain. It's more

To the Protestant Reader.

Engines than a few that are openly or secretly at work at this time, to captivate these Nations again to the Romane Pope. When so many hundreds, if not thousands are night and day contriving our seduction, under the name of Reconciling us to the Church; if no body counterwork them, what may they not do. It's not enough that we have had Defenders, and that their Books are yet in the World. Old Writings are laid by; though much stronger than any new ones: But new ones are sooner taken up and read. The Papists have of late been very plentiful, and yet very sparing in their Writings. Plentiful of such as run among the simple injudicious people in secret, so that the Countries swarm with them; But sparing of such as may provoke any Learned man to a Confutation: That so, they may in time disuse us from those Studies, and so disable the Ministry therein, and catch us when we are secure through a seeming peace, and fall upon us when we have lost our strength. And I am much afraid that the generality of our people (perhaps of the best), are already so much disused from these studies, as to be much unacquainted with the Nature of Popery, and much more to seek for a preservative against it, and a thorough confutation of them. So that if Papists were once but as fully set out among us in their own likeness, as they
are

To the Protestant Reader.

are under the names of Quakers and other Sects, what work would you see in many places? I doubt many would follow their pernicious wayes, and fall like Sheep of a common rot, or people in a raging pestilence, especially if they had but the countenance of the times: Not through their strength, but because our people are naked, and unmeet for a defence.

The work that now they are upon, is, 1. By Divisions, and Reviling the Ministers, to loosen the people from their Guides, that they may be as a Masterless Dog that will follow any body that will whistle him.

2. To take down the Ministers maintenance and encouragements, that they may be disabled so vigorously to resist them.

3. To hinder their union, that they may abate their strength, and find them work against each other.

4. To procure a Liberty of seducing all they can under the name of Liberty of Conscience, that so they may have as fair a game for it as we: And ignorance and the common corruption of nature (especially so heightened by a custome in sin) doth befriend the Devils cause much more than Gods; or else how comes it to pass that the Godly are so few, and Error, Idolatry and impiety doth so abound in all the earth!

To the Protestant Reader.

5. To break the common people into as many Sects and parties as they can, that they may not onely employ them against one another, but also may hence fetch matter of reproach, against our profession in the eyes of the World.

6. To plead under the name of Seekers against the certainty of all Religion; that men may be brought to think that they must be either of the Popish profession or of none.

And indeed when all Sects have done their worst it is but two, that we are in any great danger of (And of those I think we are in more danger, then the most are aware of) And that is, 1. Papists: who plead not as other parties, onely by the tongue, but by exciting Princes and States against us, and disputing with the Fagot or Hatchet in their hands: And if we have not Arguments that will confute a Navy, an Army, or a Powder-plot, we can do no good against them.

2. Prophaneness; animated by Apostate Infidels: This is the Religion that men are born in. And men that Naturally are so endeared to their lusts, that they would not have the Scripture to be true, will easily hearken to him that tells them it is false.

Yea so much doth Popery befriend men in a vicious course, that some are apt to joyn these

To the Protestant Reader.

these together, thinking at the heart that Christianity is but a Fable: but yet for fear it should prove true & they will be Papists, that they may have that easie remedy for a reserve.

If God will preserve us but from these two dangers, Popery, and Prophaneness animated by infidelitie, it will goe well with England.

The most of my former Writings having been bent against the later; I thought it not amiss to let go this one against the former. That so I may entice the common professors to a little more serious Study of these points, and furnish them with some familiar Arguments that are suited to their capacities, that every deceiver may not find them unarmed. And here I thought it best to defend our own profession and overthrow theirs in the main, and not to stand long upon particular controversies, except that one of the Resolution and Foundation of our Faith, which is the great difference. Yet that private unstudied men may understand wherem the particular differences lie, I have given them a Catalogue of them in other mens words in the end, as resolving not to do it in my own.

In short, I have here made it plain that Popery is against Scripture, Reason, Sense,
and

To the Protestant Reader.

and against the Unity and Judgement of the Church.

1. Either Scripture is True or not true : If not, Popery is not true, which pleadeth its warrant from it (And some of them argue, as if they purposed to disprove the Scripture, and to imitate Samson, in pulling down the house on their own heads and ours, in revenge for the dishonor they have suffered by the Scripture.) If it be true (as nothing more true) then Popery is not true, which palpably contradicted it, as in the points of Latin service, and denying the Cup in the Lords Supper, and many other is most evident.

2. Either the Catholike Church is one, or not : If not, then Popery is deceitful, which waketh this its principal pretence, for the usurping the Universal Headship. If it be One then Popery is deceitful, which is renounced by the far greater part of the Catholike Church, and again renounceth them, and separateth from them, because they will not be subject to the Pope, who never yet in his greatest height had the actual Government of half the Christian world.

3. Either the Judgement of the Antient Doctors is sound or not : If not, then the Church of Rome is unsound, that is sworn to expound the Scripture onely according to their
concent:

To the Protestant Reader.

concent : If it be found, then the Church of Rome is unsound, that arrogate a Universal Government and Infallibility, and build upon a foundation, that was never allowed by the Antient Doctors (as in the third Disput. I have fully proved) and which most Christians in the world do still reject.

4. Either Reason it self is to be renounced or not : If it be, then none can be Papists but mad men. If not, then Popery must be renounced, which foundeth our very faith upon impossibilities, and teacheth men of necessity to believe in the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, before they believe in Christ, with many the like which are afterwards laid open.

5. Either our five Senses, and the Judgement made upon them, is certain and Infallible or not. If not, then the Church of Rome, both Pope and Council are Fallible, and not at all to be trusted. For when all their Tradition is by hearing or reading, they are uncertain whether ever they heard or read any such thing; and we must all be uncertain whether they speak or write it : And then we must not onely subscribe to Franc. Sanchez, Quod nihil scitur, but also say that Nihil certo creditur. But if sense be certain and Infallible; then the Church of Rome,

To the Protestant Reader.

Rome, even Pope and Council are not onely Falsible, but certainly false deceivers and deceived. For the Pope and his Council tell the Church that it is not Bread and Wine which they take, eat and drink in the Eucharist. But the senses of all sound men, do tell them that it is. I see that its Bread and Wine, I smell it, I feel it, I taste it; and somewhat I hear to further my assurance: And yet if Popery be not false, its no such matter. One would think the dullest Reader, might be quickly here resolved, whether Popery be true or false. Look on the consecrated Bread and Wine, touch it, smell it, taste it, and if thou canst but be sure that it is indeed Bread and Wine, thou maist be as sure that Popery is a delusion. And if thou canst but be sure, that it is not Bread and Wine, yet thou maist be sure that the Pope or his Council, nor any of his Doctors are not to be believed. For if other mens senses be deceitful, theirs and thine are so too.

But these things are urged in the following Disputations.

Its worth the observing how much they are at odds among themselves, about the Resolution of their Faith, and how neer some of them come to us of late, as in Tho. White's Sonus Buccinae, and Doctor H. Holden

To the Protestant Reader.

Holden de Resol. fidei, and in Cressly and Vane and others may be seen: And their silly followers in England think verily, that theirs is the common Doctrine of that Church. And how solicitous Cressly and others are to take that Infallibility out of our way as a stumbling stone, which the Italians and most of them, make the Foundation and chief corner-stone. What a task were it to Reconcile but Bellarmine and Holden? Knot and Cressly (both in English.) White had so much wit in his Defence of Rushworths Dialogues, when he wrote in English, to carry on the matter as smoothly, as if they had been all of a mind. But when he writes in Latin, How many wayes of Resolution of Faith, that are unsound can he find among the Papists as different from his own? Vid. de fide & Theolog. Tract. 1. Sect. 28. 29.

Reader, Adhere to God, and the Righteousness of Christ, and the Teachings of the Holy Ghost, by the Holy Scriptures, and a faithful Ministry, in the Communion of the Saints, and as a member of the Catholike Church, which arising at Jerusalem, is dispersed over the world, containing all that are Christians; renounce not right Reason, or thy senses; and live according to the light which

To the Protestant Reader.
which is vouchsafed thee; and then thou shalt
be safe from Popery and all other pernicious
damning errors.

Marc. 10. 165⁶.

R. B.

To



*To the Literate Romanists that
will read this Book.*

Men and Brethren,



Writing that so much concerneth
your cause, I think, should tender
you some account of its publication,
especially when I know that not onely
the divulging, but the holding of the
Doctrine contained therein, is so
hainous a matter in your eyes, that if
I were in your power, the suspicion of
it might bring me to the Rack and the
Strappado, and the confession of it
would expose me to the flames. I
have many times considered, that
you could never sure endure to
torment men in your Inquisition,
and consume them to ashes, and so
industriously to embroyle the Nations
of the earth in blood and miseries,
to work them to your minds, and set
up your own way, if you did not
think it right, and think them
exceeding bad whom you thus
destroy.

To the Literate Romanists.

stroy. I find that my own heart would serve me to use Toads and Serpents, and destroying Vermin, half as bad as you do Protestants, that is, to put them to death, though not to torment them so long: but for gentler and more harmeless creatures, I could not do it without a great reluctancy of my nature. I must needs therefore by your works bear you record that you have a zeal for God; but so had some before you that guided it not by knowledge, *Rom. 10. 2.* And I suppose your way is undoubtedly right in your own eyes, or else you durst never prosecute it with such violence: And yet one that was once as zealous in his way, and shut up the Saints in prison, and received authority from the high Priests to put them to death, and compelled them to blaspheme, did afterward call all this but *madness*, *Acts 26. 9, 10, 11.* But methinks I find my self obliged, when I see men differ from me with such height of confidence, to give them some Reason of my differing thoughts: And yet it is no great matter of success that I can expect from this account. To make any addition or alteration in your belief, I have no great reason to expect; while you read my words with this prejudice, that they are damnable heresie; and depend upon him whom you suppose infallible, for the fashioning of your Faith. And

To the Literate Romanists.

if I should say that I expect satisfaction from you, with any great hope, I should but dissemble. For I have not been negligent in reading such writings of your own as might acquaint me both with your Faith, and your Theological Opinions; and can scarce reasonably expect that any of you should say more to satisfy me, than these contain. For any of you to recite the Canons or Decretals of your Church or Popes, in a writing to me is in vain: For I have them at hand already, or can have them at a trice. And if you say any thing to me by way of Answer, which is not in those Canons or Decretals, or solemnly pronounced already by your Church to be *de fide*, you can give me little assurance of its verity; but your own writing must incur all those reproaches, which *Knot* bestows on the Doctrine of *Chillingworth*, and we hear from you so frequently, for the defect of Infallibility. But yet, let what will come of it, I shall leave some slender Testimony to posterity, that I dissented not from so many confident men, without giving them some of the Reasons of my dissent.

I was born and bred here among the Professors of the Reformed Catholick Christian Religion. When I was young, I judged of your Profession as I was taught, and the prejudice which I received against it, did grow up with me, as yours doth against us. Yet re-

To the Literate Romanists.

ceiving much good to my soul by *Parsons* Book of Resolution corrected (when I was but sixteen years of Age) it run much in my mind, that sure there were some among you that had the Fear of God. When I was capable of it, by Age and Studies, I made some diligent search into your Writers, that I might know the true state of the controversies betwixt us. But still I confess I read them with prejudice and partiality; till at last I attained (as far as I can understand by my own heart) such a love to the truth, and an impartiality in my Studies and judgement of these things, that I read your Writers, with as free a mind (I mean, as willing to find what truth was there to be found) as I do the Writings of Protestants themselves. When I had discovered undoubtedly that in some doctrinal points, the differences were made by most on both sides, much greater then they were, and much greater then the most Learned on both sides that had any moderation, did conceive them to be. I was the more confirmed in my resolutions to be impartial in my Studies, and so have proceeded (if I be a competent judge of my own mind) to this day. And after all, I am left in the dissatisfaction which I here manifest. And by what steps my averseness to your way hath been brought on since I began to search into it impartially; I shall here further declare.

First

To the Literate Romanists.

First, I have been most offended with those doctrines and practices, that did most notoriously run against the stream of the Holy Scripture; for here the case was so plain that without any singular acuteness it might be discerned: as in your Latin Service of God with those that understand it not, your administering the Bread in the Lords Supper without the cup; that Image-worship which your Writers do maintain, forbidding Priests marriages, with many such like. And yet suspecting my own understanding, I read what your Writers say also for these: But when I saw how palpably they forced the text, it increased my dislike: And then knowing that you contradicted the Scriptures in *these*, and finding withal that you build your faith upon your Churches Infalibility, I was exceedingly turned against your profession, when I saw your foundation so clearly overthrown. But yet this was not all: There was scarce any thing that more offended me, then the tendency of your Doctrines, to destroy the Knowledge of the people, and lead them on in ignorance, and please and deceive them by a company of ceremonies, instead of a Reasonable service of God: and the manner of your worship I could never digest. Other things did grate very hard upon those truths which I was confirmed in, but *these* went against the very bent of my heart, and

To the Literate Romanists.

crossed the very ends of my Religion and my Life. Your keeping the Scriptures from the Laity, as far as you do; and maintaining it so commonly to be the Original of Heresies to translate them into a known tongue; and making it so deadly a crime to have a Bible which they can read; with your Latin Service aforesaid, and the formalities and scenical worship in which you train up the ignorant vulgar with many other things in your doctrine and practice, are such as leave me but little room for deliberation, whither I should own them or not, because they are so plainly against the very end of the Christian Religion. Had these things come under my consideration in a carnal state, when the flesh was my end, and not God I know not how I should have entertained them. But your own Doctors consent that God must be my end, and chiefly Loved, desired, and sought: And will you teach a man this, and whoodwinke him when you have done? Will you bid him love God, and keep him from the Knowledge of him? Will you bid him desire and seek him, and when you have done lock him up in the dark? Or will you bid him serve and obey him, and yet forbid him to search after the knowledge of his laws and will? If you would bring me to be of these opinions, your reasonings would be to as much purpose as if you should perswade me to put out my eyes

To the Literate Romanists.

eyes and put them in your pockets, for fear of missing my way in my race, when my life is at the stake: Or as if you should perswade me to be ignorant of Plowing and Sowing, and Merchandize, and yet to seek after provision and riches in the world. I am as easily reconciled as another to those that step out of the path that I am in, if they go towards the same end: But if you would teach me to turn my back upon Heaven, as the onely way to attain it, this will not easily down with me: I know that *God is light, and with him is no darkness*; and that *Christ is the light of the world*, and his spirit is the illuminater of the Saints, and the word is a *light to our feet, and giveth wisdom to the simple*: And yet would you have us refuse this Light, and choose the Darkness? I know that Satan is *the prince of darkness*, & a state of death is a state of *darkness*, tending to *outer darkness*: and that it is the saving way of God to *translate men out of darkeness into his marvellous light*: And yet would you perswade me that this is the way of Life? What a difference is there between this doctrine of yours, and the very scope of Scriptures, and antient Writers, and the sense of a gracious soul? *Solomon would have men to Hide the commandment with them, and incline their ear to wisdom, and apply their hearts to understanding, and cry after knowledge, and lift up their voice for understanding,*

[a 3] ing,

To the Literate Romanists.

ing; and seek for it as silver, and search after it as for hid treasure, Prov. 2. 2, 3, 4. And is your Doctrine like this? Isay bids, To the Law and the Testimony. If. 8. 20. And the Bereans are commended for searching the Scriptures daily to see whether the things were so that were taught them even by Apostles : And will you forbid this, and burn men for to promote their salvation? Did not Paul write his Epistles to the Laity as well as to the Clergy? You must strip me of the grace of God, and reduce my mind to a state of darkness, before I can ever entertain these principles of darkness : For light and darkness will not have communion. If by Arguments you would persuade me, so plainly against the life of nature, as that I am bound to blind or kill my self in order to my good, there's somewhat within me that would confute them besides reason : And why should not the Life of Grace also be a principle of self-preservation? As for your Reason, that men must let alone the Scripture and hearken to their Teachers for fear of heresies, it will never take with me till I can believe you to be less suspected guides then Christ and his Apostles, and till I can believe that a Scholar may not learn of his Book & his Teacher both without any contradiction.

And then for your devotions, it is not all the Arguments in the world, that would ever
re-

To the Literate Romanists.

reconcile me to them, while I have that Law in any prevailing measure written in my heart, that teacheth me to worship God in Spirit and in truth. What man of Spiritual experience can choose but distaste your way of worship, that doth but read over one of your offices, and Lady's Psalters, and see the affected repetition of words, and the ludicrous kind of devotions, which you teach the people, more like to charms than serious prayers to God! especially if he also observe the huge number of ceremonies which the very body of your worship is composed of. As there is somewhat in nature, that hindereth a man, from delighting to eat chaffe, or feeding upon meer air, so is there somewhat in the new nature of a Christian, that is against this trifling and jesting with God.

* Another thing that hath encreased my distaste of your wayes, is the common ungodliness of your

* The abominable wickedness of your party, even the *Romane* Cardinals themselves, is proclaimed by many that have been your Priests

and turned from you: as *Copley*, *Sheldon*, *Boxborne*, and many more saith *Sheldon* (in his Survey of Rome: Miracles, p. 18. having spoken of the Cardinals Sodomy) [Believe it Reader, the abominations which are committed by these purpured Fathers, and the Supream Fathers of that Synagogue are so detestable, that they pass all narration either of modest or immodest pen.] And it's long since *Petrarch*, *Dantes*, *Aventine*, *Parisien*, *Clemangis*, *Sabellicus*, *Grosthed*, *Ferus* and more of your own Writers have said enough, to satisfy us of your sanctity. Many a one that hath been ticed to Popery in *England*, have been cured by a journey to *Rome*, seeing the abominations of that place.

To the Literate Romanists.

followers. I have endeavored as well as I could to be acquainted with them where I came and I have known but very few of them, but have been either Whoremongers, or Swearers, or Drunkards, or Gamesters, or sensual livers: nor did I ever meet with one to this day, to my best remembrance, that manifested a spiritual frame of heart, or had any delight to speak of the workings of God upon the soul, and the sweet communications of the love of Christ, or could give any savory account of any such spiritual workings in them: but all their Religion was to stick to the Romish Church, and go on in their ceremonious forms of worship, abstaining from this meat, or that, and rioting and pampering their flesh on Holidayes, &c. If I had known this to be the case onely of the common people in *Italy*, or *Spain*, or *France*, I should not have wondered: for I know that most of the people, do take up their Religion but upon carnal accounts, and accordingly will use it: But to find it thus in *England*, where your number is small, and you pretend to hold your Religion in so much self-denyal, the state being against you; and therefore your party should be the purest zelots, and shew the face of your doctrine in its greatest glory; this makes me judge of the tree by the fruites. And the observing of this hath made me admire,

To the Literate Romanists.

mire, that ever you can make the holiness of your Church, the matter of so great ostentation as you do: Yea that such men as *H. P. de Cressy* can have the face to pretend that your admirable holiness in comparison of ours, was the means of their conversion to you. Unhappy man! with whom did he converse while he seemed a Protestant? or where did he live? But this was not his fate alone; but of divers of his strain. When they are carnal Protestants, abhorring the power of the Religion, which they profess, and avoiding and reproaching the practicers of their own Religion, and so have no communion with them, nor experience of their holiness; it is a righteous thing with God to leave them to so much blindness, as to run from *England* to *Rome* for holiness; and that because they abhorred purity, they should be so blinded as not to discern the beauty of it, and yet to dote on the name and coate of it, which may be put on in the morning, and off at night. And indeed this hath somewhat increased my avernsness; to observe that by how much the more godly and conscionable any are of our profession, the more they are against yours: and that so few of this sort are turned to you, that I yet know not certainly of one, that ever seemed a Godly person. And the common ignorant sort of people that know not
what

To the Literate Romanists.

what a Church is, nor what Religion is, and that live in sensuality and wickedness, are the favourablest to your wayes; yea so forward to promote them that many of them would quickly be yours if the times were but changed to you; and these are the people that I have known become your proselites. When we have lost our labor upon them, and left them in their wickedness, and they that were filthy are filthy still, then some of them turn Papists, and this forsooth in admiration of the holiness of your Church: When I confess for some of them, I have not been sorry to hear that they were turned to you: for I thought, it may be the liking they have to you, might make them hearken more to your reproofs, then to ours, and possibly you might perswade them from Whoredoms and Drunkenness, and Swearing, and Lying, when we were out of hope: But when I perceived that they fled to you for an indulgence in their sin, because some of these are but venial sins with you, and they have a palliate ceremonial cure at hand to befool them; I then acknowledged the justice of God against them. I am none of those that think that there is none among you shall be saved. I have read that in some of your Writers, that perswadeth me it came from a sanctified heart. I am ready to acknowledge and honor the Spirit of Christ where-

To the Literate Romanists.

wherever I can discern it. But I must profess that I was never yet so happy as to converse with a Papist, that manifested an experienced, gracious, heavenly mind; though I am truly willing to make the best of them. And that your Church should be as the sink or channel, to receive the excrements and filth of ours, is no great argument of its holiness in my eyes. And if a few that are less sensual turn to you, it is commonly, as far as I can discern, the Tenants or servants of some of your way, that are led by worldly respects, and they are such ignorant souls that they know not what the Religion is which they are turned to, nor are able to give a reason of their change. I have spoke with some affected to your way, and some turned to it, that have thought our doctrine was yours, and yours was ours: for instance, that we taught that men might live without sin, and you taught otherwise: and have denyed that you hold the doctrine of mans merits, and divers the like. Are not these good Catholikes, and well converted, that be of our mind, and do not know it? And I observe among your own Writers, that usually those that write in the most heavenly strain, are those that give some wound to your profession, by some considerable opposition, as *Mirandula*, *Gerson*, *Bernard*, and many more.

And

To the Literate Romanists.

And it hath more disaffected me to your way, to observe how low the design of your Religion is, in comparison of ours: You can let the common people be as blind as Moles, and worship they know not what! And you almost confin Religion unto Votaries and Cloysters. Whenas the design of our Religion is to make the generality of our Pastoral charge more holy by far then your retired Votaries. And (as far as I am able to learn) I do verily think that there are in the small Town that I live in, some hundreds of souls, that have more true self-denyal, humility, acquaintance with the saving works of Grace, abhorrence of sin, delight in God, and believing serious thoughts of heaven, then is to be found in twenty of your Monasteries. When I am in one of their meetings which you account but a cursed Schismatical conventicle, I can behold their diligent attendance, their humble learning, their modest, orderly, serious devotions, and afterwards their painful recollections and improvement of what they learn. But among you, I should see a dumbe shew, a pompous ostentation, compounded of Ceremonies, and words which are as no words, being not by the people understood. And I am certainly informed by travellers that have known them, and by your own confessions, that you have Priests even like your people and your services. Even unlearned

To the Literate Romanists.

learned men, that are but able to read their Mass; like some of the worst of our old Readers, whom we have cast out: However you may have learned Jesuites and Fryars, that are bred up chiefly for your Theological wars, while the people that live in peace under you are famished.

It hath also much increased my disaffection, to observe, by what gross kind of cheating you carry on your cause. You make a noise with the ostentation of Miracles; but we can never see one of them, nor have certain proof of it. I confess if I could see them, they would work on me much: and I would go from Sea to Sea to see one: but I know not whither to go with the least hope of such a sight.

You talk much of perfection, and keeping the Law of God without sin: But how long will it be before you will shew us one of those sinless perfect men? I have enquired of those that I thought most likely, and they have told me that such men there be in the world, but would not be intreated to shew me one of them. Nay, it amazeth me, that you should glory of perfection, where it is so hard to find sincerity, and to meet with a man that will not curse and swear, and whore, and be drunk. Yea more to find that after this ostentation of perfection, you come so low as to make those to be perfect which we suppose to be in a damnable state:

For

To the Literate Romanists.

For how many abominable sins do you make to be venial? Do I need to tell you what some of your own Writers say of Fornication; and of a Priest rather keeping a Concubine then a wife; and what gaines have come to the Church by Whorehouses? and what a trade it is at *Rome* and *Venice*, &c. To give instance but in the sin of lying, how light do you make of it? yea you fear not to teach your English Profelytes, That [*A lye is a mortal sin, when it is any great dishonor to God, or notable prejudice to our neighbor; Otherwise if it be meerly officious or jesting it is but a venial sin*] They are the words of H. T. (they say Henry Turberville) in his Catechism, pag. 160. Yea he saith pag. 268. That [*By this we must know when a sin is mortal, and when venial: Because to any mortal sin it is required, both that it be deliberate and perfectly voluntary---*] And then set altogether, and consider what your Writers make of venial sin: no worse then your Doctor *Thomas*, saith, that [*Venial sin hath not perfectam rationem peccati, but is Analogically called sin: and that non est contra Legem; quia venialiter peccans non facit quod lex prohibet, nec pretermittit id ad quod lex per preceptum obligat, sed facit prater legem: It is not against the Law, nor forbidden by it, but beside it.*] 12. qu. 88. art. 1. ad 1. And that it deserves not damnation; and eternal punishment is not due to it, but temporal onely,

To the Literate Romanists.

12. q. 87. a. 5. c. & q. 88. a. 1. c. And that it induceth not a blot on the soul, 12. q. 89. a. 1. c. But onely as it hindereth the lustre of Grace, and therefore may be done away without the infusion of habitual grace, 3. q. 8. 7. 2. c. Apply this now to your last instanced case. It seems now that the Law of God forbiddeth not Lying, when it dishonoreth God but a little and not greatly, or when it is a prejudice to another but not notable; It forbids not men to lie Officiously or in jest; as *H. T.* speakes. Nay it seems if you curse or swear or blaspheme the name of God, or kill your own Father or Mother, it is but a venial sin, if you do it not deliberately, and perfectly voluntarily. And is not here a fine doctrine to make men perfect? Have you no way to make your selves perfect, but by making the Law of God imperfect? How can you perswade us to value such perfection? Doth *H. T.* think that a man that hath the use of Reason is not bound by God to deliberate of all the weighty actions of his life! And if a man shall kill and blaspheme in passion, and say [*I did not deliberate; and therefore it is no sin: God did not forbid it me:*] Shall this excuse him? Or is such doctrine to be endured among Christians? If God do not make it a reasonable mans duty to use his reason in the greatest things, and to deliberate of what he saith or doth, I know not what either Reason

To the Literate Romanists.

son or Law is made for. I think on the contrary that [Not deliberating , especially in weighty cases is a heinous sin , and the principal cause of all other sin , in many of the ungodly. So I say of the other limitation : that (it be *perfectly voluntary*) Passion may make a blasphemy or murder but *imperfectly voluntary* ; and yet that proveth not that God forbiddeth it not. For the will it self is under a Law , which puts it upon *duty* , and not onely restrains it from sinful volition or nolition : And therefore if the will do but suspend its act , in whole or in part , and thereby let the commanded faculties miscarry , I shall yet believe that this is forbidden, and a proper sin. What if you have a charge of the souls of your flock ; and you sleep while they are misled : Or if you were a Physician, and had charge of your patients lives ; and you fall asleep till they are past recovery ; are you no sinner , and do you not go against the Law ? Yes, you are a murderer : For though the thing be not voluntary *quoad actum voluntatis* , it is morally or imputatively voluntary , *propter omissionem actus*. If *Wolverhampton* Papists be fed with such doctrine as this ; they may well be *many* , but they are unlikely to be good. Inconsiderateness (which I took for one of the most destroying sins) it seems is a notable preservative from sin : For be sure you deliberate not , and
you

To the Literate Romanists.

you break no Law of God what ever you do. And if there be no Law against Lying, except the lyes of the higher strain that are by *H. T.* excepted, no wonder then if Papists be Lyars.

And can you think it any injury to you if from hence I interpret, not onely many of your Historical writings (such as the Image of both Churches, &c.) but also much of the judging that is in *England* at this day. If you put your selves in the Garbe of Quakers, Euthusiasts, Anabaptists, &c. and pretend that you are of their opinions, and deny your selves to be what you are, as long as you think that these lies are pious, and rather honor God, then greatly dishonor him, and rather do good to others, by promoting the Catholike cause, then notably injure them, can any man say, that of your opinion, that they are against the Law of God? And why call you that a venial sin, which is against no Law, when *sin* is a transgression of the Law, and where there is no Law there is no transgression, *Ioh. 3. 4. Rom. 4. 15.* And why say you that *veniam meretur*, when yet you say that *namam aternam non meretur*! How can there be *venia sine merito vel debito pene*? What need you any pardon of that which was never deserved by you? And what need you ask forgiveness of these sins, or be beholden to God for it, if the punishment to be forgiven were

To the Literate Romanists.

never due? Will you beg the remission of a debt which is no debt? *Aquinas* makes venial and mortal sin to differ as *Reparabile & irreparabile*; because from an inward principle the one may be repaired, but the other not without infused supernatural grace. But is it ever the less sin, because it is *reparabile*? Nay what needs it reparation if it be not a transgression? But what is this Reparation that he speaks of? Is it the remission of the guilt and punishment? No sure: for eternal punishment he saith, it deserveth not; and internal principles do not sure forgive the punishment of sin? Can we forgive our selves? What is it then? Is it the removing of the blot? No: properly *peccatum veniale non inducit maculam*, as before said? Is it that venial sin is easier conquered and forsaken then mortal? No sure: For *Aquinas* tells us that a man may live for a little while without venial sin, but not long

Veniale, culpa non est, sed dispositio ad culpam. Reinerius. Cont. Waldens. ubi infra.

but without mortal sin, they may easily live till death. What this reparation then is, I do not certainly know. But whatever it is, methinks it should suppose a proper sin, and not onely Analogical, an a desert of eternal punishment to be remitted.

And here I must adde, that another thing that lately hath much disaffected me to you

pro

To the Literate Romanists.

profession, is to see by what actual fraud and
juggling it is propagated. Do you think I see
not the game that you are now playing in the
darke in *England*, in the persons of Seekers,
Behmenists, Paracelsians, Origenists, Quakers,
and Anabaptists? I must confess I naturally ab-
hor collusions and dissimulation in the matters
of God. If your way were of God, it need-
ed not such devices to uphold it, nor would it
suit so well with works of darkness? If you
have the truth, produce it naked, and deal plain-
ly, and play above board! For my part I do not
fear being cheated out of my Religion, by any
thing but seeming force of Argument: for I
mean to know what I receive before I take it,
and to taste and chew it before I let it down:
but the blind incautelous multitude, and half
witted giddy persons, and discontented licenti-
ous half studied Gentlemen, may possibly be
deceived by such chaffe as this.

Another of your dissimulations which in-
creaseth my dissatisfaction is, Your pretending
to the ignorant people, that you are all of a
mind, and there are no divisions among you,
and making our divisions the great Argument
to raise an odium against our doctrine, calling us
Schismaticks, Hereticks and the like. When
indeed no one thing doth so much turn away my
heart from you as your abominable Schism.
Do we not know of the multitudes of Opini-

To the Literate Romanists.

ons among you, mentioned by *Bellarmino* and other of your Writers? If you call me out to any more of this work, I mean the next time to present to the world a Catalogue of your Divisions among your selves, that it may appear how notable your unity is? If the Jesuites are to be believed, what a silly sottish generation are your secular Priests? If your Priests are to be believed, what a seditious hypocritical, cheating packe are the Jesuites? I speak not the words of your Protestant adversaries, but of those of your own Church. Do I not know what *Guiliel. de Sancto Amore* and many another say of your own Church? Do you think I never read *Watsons Quodlibets*, and the many pretty stories of the Jesuites exploits there mentioned by him? I do not think that you suffer many of your own followers to read these books that are written against one another by your selves. But the great division among you, that quite overthrows your cause in my esteem, is that between the *French* and *Italian*, in your very foundation which all your faith is resolved into. You have no belief of Scripture, nor in Christ, no hope of heaven, you differ not from *Turkes* and *Infidels*, but onely upon the credit and authority of your Church: And this Church must be infallible, or else your faith is fallible: At least it must be of sovereign authority. And when it comes to the upshot, you are not agree

wha

To the Literate Romanists.

what this Church is? One saith it is the Pope with a General Council; and another saith it is a General Council, though the Pope dissent. One saith the Pope is fallible, and the other saith a Council is fallible. One saith, a Pope is above the Council, and another saith the Council is above the Pope. And now what is become of your Religion? Nay is it not undeniable that you are of two Churches specifically different? Certainly a body Politick is specified from the *summa potestas*. And therefore if the *French* make a Council the *summa potestas*, the sovereign power; and the *Italians* make the Pope the sovereign, and a third party make the Pope and Council conjunct only, the sovereign, are not here undeniably several Churches specifically different?

And then you have another deceit for the salving of all this, that increaseth my disaffection. You glory in your present judge of controversies, and tell us it is no wonder if we be all in pieces that have no such judge. And what the better are you for your judge; when he cannot or dare not decide your controversies? No, he dare not determine this fundamental controversie, whether himself or a Council be the sovereign power, for fear of losing the *French* and those that joyn with them. So that it must remain but *dogma Theologicum*

To the Literate Romanists.

and no point *de fide*, what is the *summa potestas*, and yet all that is *de fide*, even our Christianity and Salvation must be resolved into it? And doth not this directly tend to infidelity? Would you have serious Christians deliver up themselves to such a maze as this for the obtaining of unity? What the better are you for a judge of controverſie, in all thoſe hundreds of differences that are among your ſelves, when your judge either cannot or will not determine them? Are not we as well without him as you are with him? Plain things that are paſt controverſie have no need of your judge! It is no controverſie with us whether Chriſt be the *Meſſiah*, whether he roſe, aſcended and will judge the world: And if we go to darker points, your own judge will ſay nothing or worſe. Why do you cry out ſo much againſt expounding the Scripture otherwiſe then according to the ſence of the Church, when your Church will give you no interpretation of them? Do not your expoſitors differ about many hundred texts of Scripture, and neither Pope nor Council will decide the controverſies? Theſe are therefore meer deluſions of the world, with the empty name of a judge of controverſies. And indeed you ſometime ſhew your ſelves that you have no ſuch high conceit of your Pope (whatever you would make the world believe) as to truſt his judgement. Your own Prieſt *Watſon* tells

To the Literate Romanists.

us in his *Quodlib. pag. 56. 57.* That the Jesuites
“ [Preached openly in *Spain* against Pope Six-
“ tus the last of all holy memory, and railing a-
“ gainst him and against a most wicked man, and
“ monster of earth: they have called him a
“ *Lutherane* heretic, they have termed him a
“ Wolf; they have said, he had undone all
“ Christendome if he had lived: and Cardinal
“ *Bellarmino* himself as judge paramount being
“ asked what he thought of his death, answer-
“ ed, *Qui sine penitentia vivit, & sine peniten-*
“ *tia moritur, proculdubio ad infernum descendit:*
and to an English Doctor of our Nation he said,
“ [Conceptis verbis, quantum capio, quantum
“ sapio, quantum intelligo, descendit ad infer-
“ num.] And yet we must hold our Belief in
Christ on the credit of such a mans infallibi-
lity.

But yet I have not come to that point of
your Schisme which above all things in the
world doth alienate my mind from your pro-
fession. And that is your separation from all
other Christians in the world! I find in my self
so great an inclination to unity, and the title
[Catholike] is so honourable, in my esteem,
to them that deserve it, that if I had found
you to have the unity and Catholike Religion
and Church which you boast of, it would have
much inclined me to your Church and way. But
when I find you like the Donatists confining the

To the Literate Romanists.

Church to your party, and making your selves a Sect and Faction, and unchurching and damning the far greatest part of the Christians in the world; this left me assured that you are most notorious Schismatics. When I saw so much knowledge and holiness comparatively among the Reformed Catholikes, and so much ignorance and wickedness among the Papists (even here where are but a remnant that adhere to their Religion against the course of the Nation) and when I read so many plain promises in Scripture, that *Whoever believeth in Christ shall not perish*, and that *if by the spirit we mortifie the deeds of the body we shall live*, and that *if we Repent our sins shall be forgiven*, yea that *Godliness hath the promise of this life and that to come*; and then when I find that the Papists for all these certain promises, do unchurch and damne us all, because we believe not in the Pope of Rome as well as in Christ; this satisfied me as fully that you are most audacious Schismatics, as I am satisfied that you are Papists. What! must I be a Papist on such grounds as these? Must I believe because you tell me so, that all the most conscionable heavenly Christians that I am intimately acquainted with are un sanctified, ungodly, and in a state of damnation? When I am a witness of the earnest breathings of their souls after more communion with God; When they would not live in one of those

To the Literate Romanists.

those sins that you call *venial*, for all the world; When they mortifie the flesh, and live in the spirit, and wait for Christs appearance. And yet that such as the Papists shall be saved that are so far below them, because they believe in the Pope of *Rome*? Why you may almost as well perswade me to become a Papist by telling me that you have eyes in your heads, and noses on your faces, and the rest of the world have none. Doth Christ say, *He that believeth, and repenteth shall be saved*; and must I believe that all Protestants shall be damned, let them believe and repent never so much? This is to bid me [*cease to believe Christ*] that I may believe the Pope [*Cease to be a Christian*] that I may become a Papist. I am confident I shall never be Papist, if it may not be done but by believing that all the Godly that I am acquainted with are ungodly, and in the way to hell.

And (to speak of the quantity as well as the quality) I feel a kind of *universal charity* within me, extending to a *Christian as a Christian*, and therefore to *all the Christians* in the world, which will not give me leave to believe if a hundred Popes should swear it, that the far greatest part of Christians shall be

Armeniorum Ecclesia, & Ethiopum & Indorum & cetera quae Apostoli converterunt, non subsunt Romana Ecclesia. Reinerius cont. VValdens. Catal. in Bibliothec. Par. T. 4. p. 773.

dam-

To the Literate Romanists.

damned, because they are not subjects to the Pope! The Papists are but a handful of the Christians in the world; at least the smaller part by far! The most of them never acknowledged the sovereignty of your Pope. And a few ages ago, before Mahometanism and Hea-thenism diminished the number of Christians in *Asia* and *Africa*, the Papists were but a small proportion. There are but lately taken off from the Christian Religion, its probable, twice as many as all the Papists in the whole world: If it were but the Kingdomes of *Nubia* and *Tenduc*, how far would they go on this account? A Bishop of your own, and Legate of the Popes that dwelt in those Countries, saith, that the Christians in the Easterly parts of *Asia* alone, exceeded in multitude; the Christians both of the Greek and Latin Churches: *Jacob. a Vitriaco Hist. Orient. c. 77.* And which is more; the whole Church for many hundred years after Christ were far from being the subjects of the Pope of *Rome*! And indeed had Christ no Church till the Pope became universal Monarch? Must *Paul* be damned because he was not one of *Peters* subjects? Do not your consciences know that swearing obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, was a thing unknown for many hundred years, yea that it is a novelty in the world? Must Christ lose for ever the most of his Church, even those that never heard

To the Literate Romanists.

heard of *Rome*; because they believe not in the Pope? Never shall I be Papist while I breath, if I must be engaged to send the most of the Christians on earth, to the Devil, and that upon such an account as this. These things are so uncatholike, so unchristian, so inhumane, that I wonder and wonder a hundred times, how any learned, sober men among you, are able to believe them. For my part I am a resolved *Catholike*; that own the *universal Church of Christ*; and cannot limit my charity to a corner or a *faction*; especially so gross a one as yours. I own not the errors or other sins of any of the Churches, so far as I can discover them: But if I must make them Hereticks and unchurch them for these (yea even those that go under the name of Nestorians, and Eutichians) I must needs put you in among them, who I think do erre more grossly then they. But I am none of your judge: Nor none of your most rigid adversaries. I am one that have been oft called a Papist in print, for avoiding some of those extreams, into which some others have run from you. I am one that cannot choose but hope that there are thousands that shall be saved that profess themselves of your Church and way. But that I cannot do so my self, and the Reasons why I cannot do it, I have thought good here to let you know. Many more there are, but

To the Literate Romanists.

I have mentioned some of them in the following Disputations, to which I refer you. I can truly say this in the presence of the Lord that knows my heart, that if I knew it my self, I would most gladly turn Papist before I sleep if I could discern it to be the way of God: Yea if I had but any probability of it, and knew but the man that could give me satisfactory evidence on your side, I would wander from Sea to Sea to find him, as weak and unfit for travail as I am. And therefore if *any learned man among you*, have so much confidence of his way, and *charity* to my soul, as to *perswade* me to his opinion, *he shall at any seasonable time be wellcom*, and I shall thankfully entertain any evidence that he can bring, according to my capacity. But then I must desire him to deal plainly and *come bare face't*, and not to juggle under the vizor of a *Seeker*, or any other *Sect*; for that way will never take with me.

And I must further here profess that this paper comes not with any cruel or bloody design against you. I write not to exasperate the Governors against you, so far as to deal unmercifully with any of you. And whereas under the vizor of the sects before mentioned you are of late so earnest in pleading for a toleration, deal but impartially like honest men, and I will set in with you. Procure but a toleration for
the

To the Literate Romanists.

the Reformed Christian Religion in *Italy* and *Spaine* and your part of *Germany*, *Portugal*, &c. and I should willingly petition the sovereign Powers in *England* that you might have as much liberty here: But that *you* shall have *full* liberty here, and Protestants have *none* where you can hinder it, this is not equal dealing. But how comes it to pass that you that pretend so much to unity are in this alio of so many opinions; the *English* Papists are for liberty of Religion, and the *Spanish* and *Italian* are against it: But I must cry you mercy: I now consider, It is but your selves that you think have right to liberty here, and others should have it but in order to yours. As hardly as you think you are used in *England*, you live openly among us, and no man that I hear of layeth hands on you: When you know ~~if a~~ *Spaniard* or *Italian* be known to be a Protestant, hee's as sure tormented and burnt at a stake as the coat is on his back. Do you not know this to be true? Were I in those places where your Religion hath its will, I know one leafe of this book would cause me to be burnt to ashes: that I am alive is because I am not in your power: But for my part I wish not the shedding of one drop of your blood, nor your imprisonment or banishment, but only your moderate and necessary restraint from open iniquity and seducing of those that are unfurnished to encounter you.

To the Literate Romanists.

I have some invitation to make this profession, by the usage of a Justice of Peace of this County; who was so far your friend as to censure me and others for a late Gratulation, and petition to his Highness the Lord Protector, subscribed by many Justices, and by the Grand Jury and thousands of the County; and to censure the said petition to be of a cruel and bloody complexion; inserting to your honor and the reproach of the Reformed Churches, a vindication of your Religion from the guilt of the Powder-plot and Spanish invasion, and other foreign bloody acts, and charging as much on the Reformed as can be charged on you, according to the History, called [*The Image of both Churches.*] And what was this bloody petition of this County? Why? when you had murdered, and banished, and starved such a multitude of the poor Protestants in Savoy, and we were assured of it by a Narrative from the Lord Protector himself, inviting us to contribute to relieve the remnant, in the sense of your continued bloody dealings, and of the sad case of those poor people, and the favor of his Highness toward them, we returned him a thankful acknowledgement of his care, and added our desires to use the most effectual means to hinder the growth of so bloody a doctrine, lest it should reach our selves at last, yet adding that we desired no rigor as to your persons: but
craved

To the Literate Romanists.

craved the promoting of the Reformed Religion, and of unity among our selves as the means of our preservation. The world is come to a fair pass: when our brethren are murdered by thousands, we are bloody for mentioning it, and blaming you for it, and desiring our selves to be preserved from your doctrine and rage, so as without any rigor to our persons. Alas poor Protestants! When your throates are cut by the merciful Papists, you are cruel and bloody for saying so; When they have killed one half, the other half is bloody if they desire to escape. By my good will I'll never come to the Bench for Justice where this Gentleman hath power: For if I accuse a thief for robbing us, or a murderer for murdering twenty of my friends, I may on these terms expect to be accounted cruel for complaining: Yea though I adde [I pray Sir spare the person of the Murderer: onely do your best to prevent the death of the rest of my friends] I may look to be told its a bloody request. But perhaps if leisure serve I may say more to this Gentleman, in a full Reply to his paper.

Yea I am so far from desiring your blood, that I hope I have given you no abusive language. Sure I am, I come far short of the language that you give one another, where you may judge me to be most sharp. I had once very Reverend thoughts of your Father *Parsons*

To the Literate Romanists.

sons when I read his book of Resolution, and thought that if you had any good one it was he. And yet your own Priest Watson calls him [*An Atheal stratagemitor*, pag. 160. *A bastardly Vicar of hell*, p. 157. *Judge paramount on earth under the Diuel in Hell*, p. 156. *The arch confener*, p. 149. *That he was a bastard, dishonestly begot, basely born, a Wolsey in ambition, a Midas in immundicity, a traitor in action*, p. 108. *That all Catholikes must depend upon the Archpriest, the Archpriest upon father Garnet, father Garnet upon father Parsons, and father Parsons upon the devil, the author of all rebellious conspiracies, treasons, murders, disobedience, heresies, and all other such diabolical and bloody designments as this wicked Jesuite hath hitherto devised*] p. 151. *One that as sure as you live on earth, doth care no more for the lives of all the Catholikes themselves, then for so many dogs lives, in a time of infectious plague.*] p. 153. *Yea (saith he) questionles he could wish in his heart, to see all the seculars and other Catholikes in England hanged rather then to be frustrate of his conceited Japonian Monarchy. Yea I verily think he would be the hangman of them all himself, rather then his platform should fail, if it stood upon so desperate a point: as a fitter office for such a base irregular bastard, then to come neer Gods holy Altar, &c.*] *Quodlib.* pag. 153. 154. I will not foul my paper with any more concerning him.

And

To the Literate Romanists.

And of the Jesuites in general I have thought that there are among them some temperate vertuous men : but your Priest Watson saith, *Quodlib. p. 346.* [I call them Jesuitical, that is, the Faction of Jesuites, by a breviation, to avoid circumlocution, in one word expressing them to be a factious, seditious, ambitious, avaritious, treacherous, turbulent, Machivilian, Atheal consort, that abusing the rules of their society, and quite perverting the course, cause, institution, and intent of their order, &c.] The reasons he gives at large, p. 340. And p. 108. [The Jesuites have a special priviledge in two things. One is to make all things to be believed as Gospel, be it never so false that they speak or write: another, to make all things be judged false, be it as true as the Gospel it self, that any other shal write or speak without their approbation: But if directly against them; out upon it; it is not to be heard, spoken of, or once looked upon--- And withal, the vilest parts that can be played, are counted acts of zeal among them, if done by a Father: so as it may be any way covered with either of their two principles, scilicet, *propter verum societatis, vel ordine ad Deum.*] And p. 149. he makes their principles to be, *Omnia pro tempore, et divide & impera.* And p. 150. 151. he affirmeth that it was the Jesuites own choice and doing that the Papists had not toleration in England, because by sufferings they would

[c]

have

To the Literate Romanists.

have the people more passionately serve their designs.] This is the language of your own brethren (even more as well as he) but not mine.

To conclude, concerning these following Disputations, I need not tell you, that they are none of the elaborate writings of any champion of the Protestant cause, challenging your Answer: but a few hasty (yet considered) lines, delivered in a monthly meeting of a few Country Ministers, for mutual edification, by one that never pretended to much skill or will for such Disputes. *If any of you have a mind to try your strength, we boldly challenge you to do it on those mentioned by me in the end: to whom let me add Dr. Crakenhorpe, especially against Spalatensis and Dallaus on several particular subjects, as de Panis & satisfact. de Imaginibus, de Jeuniis and the rest. I pretend not in so small room to handle the particular differences between you and us, but to give my general reasons against you, and to choose out one particular about our foundation and yours. For I had read in Costerus Enchir. c. de sum. Pont. p. 151. 152. That Nemmen Petra plus includit quam fundamentum: fundamenta quippe edificium sustinent, Petra autem seu Rupes ipsa fundamenta, & Apostoli alia fundamenta dicuntur. Petrus vero ut Rupes solidissima, etiam fundamenta ipsa continet, & in errores & vitia labantur detinet autoritate pastore*

To the Literate Romanists.

pastorali.] And Skulkenius saith *Apol. pro Bell.* c. 6. p. 255. *Pontificia potestas est veint carão, fundamentum (& ut uno verbo omnia complectar) summa fidei Christianæ.*

Gretser saith *Def. c. 1. l. 1. de verb. Dei* p. 16. *Id solum pro verbo Dei veneramur ac suscipimus, quod nobis Pontifex ex cathedra Petri, tanquam supremus Christianorum magister, omniumque controversiarum Index definiendo proponit.*]

Bellarmin. saith lib. 4. de Pont. c. 1. *In controversiis Religionis ultimum judicium est summi Pontificis. & cap. 3. solum Petrum Christus vocavit Petram, & fundamentum; non petrum cum Concilio. Et ibid. Petrus & quilibet ejus successor est petra & fundamentum Ecclesiæ --- Ejus predicatio & confessio est radix mundi, & si illa erraret, totus mundus erraret. --- Ex quo apparet totam firmitatem conciliorum esse a Pontifice, non partim a pontifice, partim a Concilio.*] The Pope then is your foundation, yea your Church: For saith Gretser *Def. c. 10. l. 3. de Verb. Dei* p. 1450. *Per Ecclesiam intelligimus pontificem Romanum, qui pro tempore Ecclesiæ naviculam moderatur. Et p. 1451. Ecclesiam papam interpretantur: Non abnuo.*]

But the French have another foundation. But that we renounce both yours and theirs, I thought meet to tell you in the third Disputation. Accept this account from, Your friend

Ri. Baxter.



THE CONTENTS.

Disp. I.

QW Hether the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant, be a safe way to salvation? Aff.

The terms explained to pag.	p. 11
The first Argument	p. 11
The second Argument	p. 14
The third Argument	p. 16
Argument fourth	p. 17. to 26.
Obj. 1. True Religion is but one, answered	p. 26.
Obj. 2. The true Religion hath still had a visible Church professing it	p. 32
Obj. 3. Your Religion hath no certain test to discover it	p. 40
Obj. 4. You have separated from all the Churches in the world	p. 41
Obj. 5. You are divided into Sects, and have no unity among your selves	p. 42
Obj. 6. You have no infallible certainty of your Religion	p. 43
Obj. 7. You want many Articles of the faith	p. 45
Obj. 8. You condemn one another	ibid.
	Obj.

The Contents.

- Obj. 9. *Your titles shew you are Sectaries* p. 46
 Obj. 10. *You found us in possession : where was your Church before Luther ?* 47. to 52

A Defence of Bishop Ushers Sermon of the Churches unity, against the confutation of Paulus Veridicus : p. 52. to 77. Wherein the common Arguments of the Papists against us are refuted.

Disp. 2. Q. *Whether Popery be a safe way to salvation ?* Neg. p. 78

The term [Popery] and the rest explained, to p. 84

Twelve propositions for the full answering of the question p. 84

Argument 1. Popery is built upon and resolved into a notorious falsehood p. 91

Argument 2. They hold Christianity it self on a ground utterly uncertain, if not, certainly false. p. 93

Argument 3. They are disagreed among themselves in the very fundamentals p. 104

Argument 4. Popery is a novel profession, unknown to the Apostles and Primitive Church p. 106

Argument 5. They make a new Catholike Church p. 110

Argument 6. They are the greatest Schismatics on earth p. 126

Argument 7. Popery is an uncertain changeable thing, so that a man can never tell when he hath it all p. 138

Argument 8. They expressly contradict the Word of God, and set up man above it p. 142

Argument 9. They worship the creature with Divine wor-

The Contents.

<i>Worship</i>	p. 153
<i>The monstrosities of Transubstantiation</i>	p. 154
<i>Arg. 10. They turn Gods worship into scenical formalities and Ceremonies</i>	p. 161
<i>Arg. 11. Popery is upheld by most wicked means, and so by Satan</i>	p. 164
<i>Arg. 12. They adde to all, impenitency and uncurableness</i>	p. 171
<i>Arg. 13. It plungeth men into certain perjury</i>	p. 172
<i>Objections for Popery. Obj. 1. It is delivered down from the Apostles: p. 175. Obj. 2. They are a true Church: p. 177. Obj. 3. A Papist may be saved: p. 179. Obj. 4. There is but one true Church, and thats theirs</i>	p. 180
<i>Obj. 5. They have unity, universality, antiquity, succession: p. 181. Confuted.</i>	

Disp. 3. Q. Whether the infallible judgement of the Roman Pope and his Clergie must be the ground of our belief of the Christian doctrine, or of our receiving the holy Scriptures as the word of God? Neg. p. 186

The Resolution of the Protestants faith ibid.
The Popish confusion about the resolution of their faith p. 189

Three questions contained in this one. 1. Whether the Pope and his Council be judge of controversies? The truth opened in ten propositions p. 199

Arg. 1. p. 199. Arg. 2. p. 200. Arg. 3. p. 202. Arg. 4. p. 203

Obj. Shall every illiterate person be judge of the sense of Scripture? p. 205

Q. 2. Whether the Pope be infallible in this decisive judgement which he pretendeth to? p. 208

What

The Contents.

<i>What infallibility we hold</i>	p. 209
<i>An answer to that which Bellarmine saith for the Popes</i>	
<i>infallibility</i>	p. 213. to 221
<i>An answer to Knots arguments against</i>	
<i>Chillingworth</i>	p. 221. to 240
<i>Arg. 2. against their infallibility from common sense</i>	p. 240
<i>Argument 3. from experience :</i>	p. 248. arg. 4. p. 152.
<i>arg. 5. p. 253. arg. 6. p. 256. arg. 7. p. 257. arg. 8 p.</i>	
<i>258. arg. 9. p. 259. arg. 10. p. 260. arg. 11. p. 262.</i>	
<i>arg. 12. p. 267. arg. 13. p. 267. arg. 14. p. 268. arg.</i>	
<i>15. p. 207. arg. 16. & 17. p. 272. arg. 18. p. 274.</i>	
<i>arg. 19. p. 277. arg. 20. p. 278.</i>	
<i>Q 3. Whether our faith must be resolved into the infal-</i>	
<i>libility of the Romane authoritative judgment</i>	p. 278
<i>Two more Argu. against the Popes judgment</i>	p. 279
<i>That we must not receive our Religion on the credit of</i>	
<i>his judgement, manifested in twenty queres</i>	p. 281
<i>How Dr. H. Holden shuns the circle</i>	p. 282
<i>The ancient Fathers and Church fully against them</i>	
	p. 295. to 351
<i>Their Obj. against us for our want of infallibility, an-</i>	
<i>swered</i>	p. 351. to 356
<i>More out of antiquity against them</i>	p. 357. to 364
<i>Their own usurpation against Scripture</i>	p. 365
<i>Vincentius Lirinensis against them</i>	p. 368. to 373
<i>Dr. Fields Catalogue of Popish errors</i>	p. 375
<i>Appendix, Bishop Downnames Catalogue of Popish er-</i>	
<i>rors : p. 381. to the end.</i>	

Errata.

Errata.

Page 11. line 33. read go p. 12. l. 21. dele is p. 12. l. 25. r. from
p. 10. l. 8. r. necks p. 12. l. ult. d. purposely p. 29 l. 3 r. good p.
35. l. 22. r. satisf. *Flory* .38 l. 18. r. we p. 38. Mar. 50 Dr *Wine*
&c. should be printed p. 39. l. 20. d. not p. 44. l. 13. r. the p. 41.
l. 9 r. where p. 48. l. 24. r. decide's p. 50. l. 1 r. symptoms p. 51.
33 r. Egyptian (*h* ians p. 58. l. 6. r. Sacran. l. 7 r. Esteril. 15.
d. and the Maronites l. 25 r. the p. 59. l. 24. r. cause, or at p. 60 l. 11.
r. The Lutheran p. 63 l. 26. r. will and p. 74. l. 1. r. of most of the
74 l. 26. d. and by oblation p. 76. l. 30. r. held p. 86 l. 1 r. Council
p. 86. l. 24. r. diffident l. ult. r. on p. 91. l. 29. r. seated p. 101. l. 10.
r. John and p. 107. l. 17 r. necessarily p. 108. l. 3 r. new l. 14.
council is l. 14. r. tra^h Arcetur p. 114. l. 28. d. to be new p. 115 l. 19.
r. *Teminum* p. 120. l. 17. r. consequence p. 122 l. 1. r. name p. 130.
29. r. there p. 131. l. 3 r. on p. 134. l. 24 d. not p. 135 l. 2. r. an
interrupte p. 138 l. 14 r. school 140. l. 13. r. they l. 32. d. (6 p. 146.
l. ult. r. procut hinc p. 148. l. 1 r. last p. 149. l. 26. r. 17, 18 19. p. 154.
l. 1. r. his p. 166 l. 22. r. they may p. 167 l. 11. r. Bolsec p. 172 l. 4 d.
we p. 75. l. 26 r. is p. 17. l. 25. r. safe way l. ult. d. it p. 187 l. 27.
add by p. 189 Mar. add some 192 l. 4 add and p. 202 l. 22. r. u
p. 209. l. 7. d. the p. 226 l. 2 r. mentioned l. 2 r. was l. 6. r. unques
tionably p. 232. l. 1 add not p. 243 l. 7. r. illud r. p. 247 l. 9. d.
sell p. 249. Mar. r. Kranzius p. 250 l. 10. r. the twenty second l. 17.
add not 251. l. 15. r. decrees p. 255. Mar. r. succeeding p. 268 l. 33.
r. will p. 273 l. 11. r. episcopi p. 273 l. 15. r. ibi p. 282 l. 11. r.
expirum p. 284 l. 2 r. the p. 285 l. ult. r. impario p. 286 l. 7. d.
apertum p. 29 l. 21. d. it p. 308 l. 18 r. judicial p. 309 l. 28. r. con
fute p. 314. l. 28. r. theirs p. 331. l. 17. r. Montanus p. 333. l. 2. r.
Fatiannus p. 41. l. 2. r. cateris p. 342. l. 1. r. r. suburbis aris l. 34.
headed p. 342 l. 16 r. 10 us p. 348 l. 2. r. Remiel. 4. r. authors
355. l. 10 r. word l. 23 r. proverb p. 356. l. 2. r. rather than p. 358.
Marg. add del. 28. r. literis p. 359. l. 31. r. secura p. 364 l. 11. d.
i. e. p. 366. l. 8. r. *Gloss* p. 370. l. 8. r. faisse & p. 371. l. 28. add
l. 3. add other p. 377 l. 5 r. knew l. 28. r. the p. 380 l. 23. r. in p.
379 l. 12. r. *catalogus*. p. 217. l. 2. after [faish] adde [Or the
object of faish, even Christ himself (which indeed is the true sense,
agreeable to 1 Cor. 10. 4. And that Rock was Christ.)]



Q U E R Y.

*Whether the Reformed Catholike
Christian Religion, commonly
called Protestant, be a safe
way to Salvation?*



THE great business of the Divil the
Enemy of Mankinde, is to keep man
from that Salvation, which Christ
hath so dearly purchased, so graci-
ously offered, and hath appointed us
such excellent helps to attain: To which end it is
his first endeavor, that men may not know or Believe
that there is such a Felicity, and what it is, and
how much to be desired; and *his next*, to keep them
from knowing the way to it, and the *last* is, to keep
them from walking in that way when they know it.

By the first means he keeps from Salvation, all Atheists and Heathens that know not, or believe not the life to come: by the second, all Infidels that Believe not Christ to be the way, and all Hereticks that Believe not those Truths which are of absolute necessity in subordination to Christ: and by the third, all Hypocrites and unsanctified, ungodly, impudent men, in the visible Church, that yet have a superficial Belief of these Truths.

Our Question in hand is for the escaping the second of these snares, by discovering which is the *safe way to Salvation*? The Policy of the Devil hath always endeavoured to hinder the world from knowing this way, by these two means: First, if it be possible by keeping them in utter darkness, that this way may not be revealed to them, or being revealed, may not be understood: Secondly, or if that will not do, by making such a number of by-ways on every side, that the true and onely way may hardly be discerned. And this is his end in raising so many Heresies; and this is the course he takes to mislead them that have escaped from the darkness of Infidelity. He begun this trade betime, even in the dayes of the Apostles: They saw the multifarious off-spring of the Deceiver sprouting up apace in their own times: yet did it never enter into their thoughts, to tell the Church, that by this, all Heresies should be known, *That the Church of Rome should condemne them*, or to send it down to all posterity as the true touchstone to tell them which was the onely right way among all these Heresies, to wit, *That which is believed by the Pope or Church of Rome*. This had been a ready and easie way for the Apostles to have prescribed, and for us to have received; if it had been true. It might

might have saved them much labor in giving us that Body of sacred Doctrine which they have made indeed the Touchstone of the *safe way*; and it might have spared us much more labor of searching and studying which is the way; and we might all have sent to *Rome*, and been resolved without any more ado. Surely the Apostles were not so envious to our ease and safety, as to have silenced this easie way if they had known it themselves. But as every Heretick when he findeth out a New way, doth condemn the Old, as inconsistent with his New, so do the Papists; Since this new way hath been cryed up, that [*No man can come to heaven but by Rome*] it is their business to deter people from any other way, and to that end, to tell them that there is no safe way but theirs. As the Quakers tell us, that there is no way to Heaven but theirs, and some * Anabaptists say there is no way to Heaven but by being Baptized (again as they are) so do the Papists tell us that there is no way to Heaven but by Believing in the Pope and Church of

* Much contrary to *Da. mascene*, who saith that the Rebaptized do crucifie Christ again, *Orthod. fid. li. 4. c. 5. p. (mibi) 296.* (Though I suppose he is as far on the other side.)

Rome, and obeying him as the head of the Church. I never saw the place, but sure that Town hath some admirable excellency in it, that the God of Heaven should so much set his heart upon it, as to endow it with such a stupendious Prerogative, that no man should be saved from everlasting Torment that doth not Believe in the Bishop of that City, and obey him as the universal head. Its a wonder to me, that he that set not his heart so much on his Temple at *Jerusalem*, or on that chosen people, as not to for-

take them for their sins, and that hath the Heavens for his Throne, and to whom the Sun it self is as Darknes, should yet be so taken with a Town called *Rome*, built and long inhabited by Idolaters, defiled with the blood of thousands of Martyrs, against which the souls under the Altar cry out [*How long Lord Holy and true wilt thou not avenge our blood &c.*] as to ordain that no man in the remotest parts of the world, even the Antipodes that never heard of the name of *Rome*, can be saved, though he should never so much believe in Jesus Christ, unless he Believe in the Bishop of this Town and obey him: when yet with *Andradius* and other Papists, its a hard question whether a man may not be saved in those heathen Countries without believing in Christ himself. Is it not a marvaile that we never read that *Rome* was once named by Christ himself, and that it never was put into our Creed as one of the necessary Articles to salvation? especially when we find there the *Catholike Church*, and Communion of Saints, which sure would have been some way intimated to be the *Romane Church* or that which is headed by their Bishop, if it had been so indeed. I find but three names (strictly so called) in the Creed, and the Popes or *Romane Churches* is none of them: One is Jesus Christ, and the other is he that bore him, and the third is his, that Judged him to death, and this indeed was a *Romane* name, and if the honor of it in the Creed will do them any service, let them make their best of it.

But however, this advantage the enemy of the Church hath got by it, that the new *Romane Title*, hath made the old *Catholike Title* seem questionable to many, and now so great is the audacity of the usurp

ing Pope, that he not onely questioneth whether any Christians shall be saved that believe not in him as well as in Christ, but he flatly denyeth it; and what he cannot get by Scripture and reason, he would get by threatning and terrible words to affright the simple, telling them that Protestants are not of the true Church or Religion, nor in a safe way to salvation, because they will not be the subjects of the Pope of Rome: Well, we shall briefly prove our way to be safe, if not to the satisfaction of perverse, ambitious, or passionate and prejudiced men, yet I doubt not to the satisfaction of all humble, impartial, diligent persons, that are willing to know the truth, and deny themselves, that they may know it, and do not stifle it by their lusts, or imprison it in unrighteousness in their byassed resolutions. And first we shall briefly open the termes.

By * [Religion] here we mean, the * Religion in Doctrine *de credendis & agendis*, a- the first sence seems to be

(1) *Martinus*) *propiè actio ejus qui res divinas studiose Relegit*, pietatis ergo, though the word be thence variously used.

(2) *Lactantius* saith (*Instit. li. 4. c. 28.*) *Hac conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos Deo justa & debita obsequia prebeamus, hanc solum noverimus hunc sequamur. Hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti Deo & Religati sumus unde ipsa Religio nomen accepit; non ut Cicero interpretatus est a Relegendo. Melius id nomen Lucretius interpretatus est, qui ait, Religionum se nodos exolvere.* Hierome in c. 9. Amos, & August. de via Rel. c. 55. & Retra. l. 1. c. 13. & li. 10. de Civit. Dei. c. 4. are for the same derivation.

(3) *Macrobius* Saturn. li. 3. c. 3. *Servius Sulpitius Religionem esse dictam tradidit quia propter sanctitatem aliquam remota ac seposita a nobis sit, quasi a relinquendo dicta, &c.* vid. Martin in verb. Sometime Religious is taken for the same with sacred, and so is applied to Persons, Actions, Things, Places, Time, &c. we here take it for a prescribed way to salvation, or that which by us is Believed or professed to be such: and this is our Religion.

bout matters to be believed and practised, which we hold and profess as of Divine Revelation, and injunction, in order to Gods Glory and our salvation. For though this be but the means towards those holy Affections and practices which are of nearer necessity to our salvation, as being the necessary effects of the former, yet is it not this later; but the former that we are now inquiring after: Not of *Subjective*, but *Objective* Religion: not of the *fides quâ*, but the *fides qua creditur*; not whether *we be true to our Religion* and so truly Religious, but whether we be *of the True Religion*, or hold that Doctrine which will save them that are true to it, in Belief and Practice. I shall not much stop the plain Reader therefore with any further and unnecessary inquiry into the Etymology of the word *Religion*, which some derive (1) a *Relegendo*, some (2) a *Religando*, and some (3) a *Relegendo & Relinquendo*: But as long as we understand what is meant by the word, we shall not stick at the Etymology or propriety.

By the [*Reformed*] Religion, we mean, the Christian Catholike Religion, as it is separated from Popery: and so by this word we do distinguish our Churches from the *Romane* Sectaries. For, it is not every Reformation (much less every thing so called) that here we have respect to, but the Reformation by which we cast off Popery it self, which because it was in one Countrey done by a solemn Protestation of certain Princes and Cities against Popery, hath been since called the Protestant Reformation, and our Churches the Protestant Churches and our Religion, the Protestant Religion.

Our Religion is called *Catholike*, because it is the Religion of the *Catholicke Church*, which is so called a καθ' ὅλῳ, because it is universal, consisting not onely of Jews and their Proselytes, as heretofore, nor of one Town like *Rome*, and those that will be the subjects of the Bishop of that Town, as the Papists dream, but of all that Believe in the name of Christ through the whole world, holding the Foundation or points of absolute necessity to salvation, and not again denying them by any such contradicting Errors, as will not consist with the practical belief of the said Fundamentals.

As that was called *A Catholike Epistle*, which was directed to the whole Church, and not to any one person or people; so is that the *Catholike Church* which containeth all Christians.

As *Austin* was wont to describe it against the Donatists (who would have confined it to the adversaries of *Cacilianus* and followers of *Donatus* in *Africke*) that the true Church was that which was spread over the world by the Gospel which was commanded to be preached to all Nations, beginning at *Jerusalem*: so do we.

By the *Christian Religion*, I suppose we are agreed, is meant the Religion of Believers in Christ, or that whereof Christ is the Foundation and prescriber, and faith in him the first act, which must contain all the essential parts (though it may possibly want many integrals) or else it is not to be called the Christian Religion. They that were called Christs Disciples were afterwards called Christians first at *Antioch*, *Act. 11. 26*. To be a Christian therefore, and to be Christs Disciple is all one.

Note therefore, that as the word *Religion* denot-

eth the sum of doctrines and way of salvation absolutely necessary, so it is but *One* in all the world (that's true and saving) and that is the *Christian Religion*. So that if a Heathen, Jew or Mahometane ask me what Religion I am of; in opposition to theirs, I will say, I am a Christian, and not onely that I am a Protestant: But if a Christian aske me what Religion I am of, I will say, I am a Reformed Catholike Christian: for such a question in the mouth of a Christian usuallly implieth that I am a Christian, and intendeth the discovery of what sort or party of Christians I belong to. But indeed Christianity is not many but one, and therefore Christians as *Christians* are not of many Religions, but of one: No nor Christians at all, that are truly such, if by Religion you mean, *a systeme of doctrines in the main, necessary or sufficient to salvation* (or conceived so to be:) For, as there is no such Body of Doctrine but Christs, so no man that is indeed a Christian, can believe that there is, seeing such a Belief contradicteth the essentia's of Christianity. But among those that call themselves Christians, there are some Hereticks that deny or plainly subvert some part of the essentials of Christian Religion. And among those that are Christians, some have such dangerous corruptions as do much hazard the salvation, and tend to frustrate them of their benefitts of the Christian Faith, and these very corruptions they Entitle by the name of Part of their Religion, as the Papists do: In which sence I must say, I am not of the same Religion with them, though I hold the same Christian Doctrine as they, because I hold not their mixture, and add not those corruptions which they make a part of their Religion.

The

The name *Protestant* I reject not, because it was taken up on a just occasion: but I take it to be too extrinsecal, and private to be the standing denomination of my Religion; as being not taken from the nature of the thing, but from an occasionall action of a few men in one Countrey; though it intimateth that all of their judgement in all other Countries, do virtually at least make the like Protestation in the maine. I do therefore rather choose to say that I am a *Reformed Catholike Christian*; and when I call myself a Protestant, this is my meaning.

So that by the name [*Christian*] which expresseth all my Religion it self Positively considered, I am differenced from Heathens, Jews, Mahometans, and all Infidels, and those (by some called Hereticks) who usurpe the name of Christians, while they deny part of the very essentials of Christianity. And by the name [*Catholike*] I adde nothing Positive to the former, but onely intimate that I am of the Universal Church, and negatively exclude my self from all divided parties, or from any that are yet in that Church, and yet take up any dividing titles or wayes therein, though they withdraw not from it; as they are such, I am none of them, and therefore disclaim (when I expresse my Religion) such private names; I am no *Lutheran*, *Calvinist*, *Arminian*, *Papist*, *Socinian*, &c. but a *Catholike*.

But yet when I say I am a *Reformed Catholike*, I purposely disclaim the Corruptions of Popery, and in that word renounce their Errors as such, as by the word *Catholike* I renounced their Schisme: And so I may agree with *Luther*, *Calvin* or any man in Reformation, so far as they hold to the word of God: so that if malicious adversaries will put the name of

Sect upon the Catholike verity, and call it by the name of *Zwinglianisme*, *Lutheranisme*, *Calvinisme* or the like, pretending that it had its spring from these men, they shall not by such unworthy means, remove me from the Catholike Religion, nor yet cause me to own their Corruptions, because they have named the opposition of them as a Heresie. *Augustine* would not turn *Donatist*, because they named the Catholikes *Cacilians*; nor would *Prosper* turn *Pelagian*, because they called the Orthodoxe, Predestinarians or Fatalists, nor would *Athanasius* before them turn *Arrian* because they called the Orthodoxe Tritheists. It is not other mens fastening upon us the name of a man, or of a Sect that proves us Sectaries, or that we had our Religion originally from that man. Yet do we so much reverence their names, that we rejoyce in their labors for the Church, and bless God for them, and endeavor to imitate them in their holy doctrine and lives, though we make none but Christ the Lord of our Faith.

As for the terms of the predicate they need no great explication. By *salvation* we mean principally Everlasting Glory in Heaven: By the *way* to it, we mean the means appointed by God for the attaining it. The principal means indeed is Christ himself, who is eminently called, The way, and no man cometh to the Father but by him. But in subordination to Christ all other means are the way.

By a *safe way*, we mean a way that *in suo genere* is sufficient to the attainment of the end; so that all that sincerely are that way shall attain that end; A certain means of happiness to all that faithfully use it.

For

For it must be known that no Religion (or sound Doctrines) will save a man that is not faithful in the reception and improvement of them. A True Religion will not save him that is not True to his Religion. And therefore it is no wonder if multitudes even of Protestants do perish, though their Religion be the onely Religion in the world. For they are not heartily of the Religion which they profess. They have that doctrine which is the seal, and fit enough of its own nature *quantum in se* to imprint the image of God upon their souls : But if they keep this seal in their Chests, and apply it not effectually to their hearts, they may have unholy hearts and lives, though they profess a holy faith and Religion, and therefore may perish for all that profession; yea and perish most deplorably because their profession doth aggravate their sin. If a mans Religion (or believed doctrines) be bad in the maine, the man himself must needs be bad too; and therefore no man of such a Religion can be saved: But if a mans Religion (or professed doctrines) be never so good it is possible he may be bad that doth profess them: and then no Religion can save a wicked man. So that of the true Religion some are saved, but not all: but of a bad Religion (in the main) no man can be good; or be saved.

I come to the Arguments by which I prove the Affirmative, that [*The Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant, is a safe way to salvation.*]

Arg. 1. That Religion which best agreeth with the word of God, above all other Religions in the world, is a safe, yea the safest way to salvation: But the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion
com-

commonly called Protestant, doth best agree with the word of God: therefore it is the safest way to salvation.

One would think among Christians the Major should be unquestionable: But here the corrupt *Romanists* have presumed to make a new word of God, that so the determination of the case might be impossible, unless we will go up to these Philistines to sharpen our weapons: For they deny the holy Scripture to be the whole word of God, or sufficient to be the Rule for deciding of controversies in matter of faith, and tell us, that unwritten Traditions are another part: And those Traditions are such as are received by the whole Church as delivered down from the Apostles; and that whole Church is onely the *Romane* party: and thus do they by their own Authority undertake to damne all the rest of the Christian world, and make themselves onely the Catholike Church: and by this trick of wit they have got one half of Gods word into their closets, and that it is his word, which they say is his word: And that you may know that they are no blabs or revealers of secrets, they have for some hundred years kept this close as a secret to themselves, yea from themselves as well as to us: so that when the common Proverb takes that to be a secret which one or two knows, but not when three know it; yet these men have a word of God which all the Catholike Church is the keeper of, and yet those that keep it, know it not themselves, much less can we that stand by come to the knowledge of it; but we must all wait till the last Pope have breathed out his last determination, before the Catholike Church that is said to keep it can come to know what is the whole

whole word of God. And so among them it is come to this pass; that to be judged by Gods word, is to be judged by the Pope and his entrusted Subjects.

But if any man whatever bring us forth a Tradition, and say, that this is the word of God and came down from the Apostles, we shall desire more then his word for the proof of it. And when he brings us as good proof that his Tradition came from the Apostles, as we shall bring him that the Scripture came from them, then will we cheerfully receive his Traditions: but not without sufficient proof, upon the boastings of corrupted interested men.

As for the Minor, that our Religion is most agreeable to the Scriptures, I shall now say but this to the proof of it. First, we take the Scriptures for the only Test or Rule of our faith and practice; and we tye not our selves to any other by-rule which may force us to a misunderstanding of it. It is onely the Scripture that we still profess doth contain our Religion: And it is the chief part of the quarrel between us and *Rome*, that they will not take this word for the perfect or sufficient Rule of Judgement. It is this word onely that we appeal to, and desire to be judged by: And the Papists wilful declining of this Tryal and Judgement doth give any impartial observer sufficient cause to suspect, that they take the Scripture to be against their cause, or else why should they not have as much confidence in it, and commit their cause to it as well as we.

2. To run over every point of difference between us and them, and prove our part by Scripture, would be a very easie work, but it would make this Disputation swell too big. And it is done so largely
and

and often already by our Writers that it is less necessary. If any of them complain for the omission of this part, let him but assure me that he will stand to the Judgement of Scripture, and I shall quickly and willingly enter the lists with him, and go over the part of the task again. In the mean time let it suffice to tell young Students, that *Amesius* his *Bellarminus Enervatus* hath spoiled all their cause of this defence, and manifested Scripture to be fully against them, in a little room; which may spare them the reading of many larger. And for the meer *English* Reader, Mr. *Ri. Bernard* in his book called, *Look beyond Luther*, in his help annexed to it, hath given a brief and effectual discovery that Scripture is not on their side, in an enumeration and proof of many of the points in difference, between them and us: which for brevity, I refer them to.

In a word, if the Scripture be true, then that Religion which agreeth with them is a safe way to salvation: But the Papists confess that the Scriptures are true: Therefore, &c. The Major is plain, in that Scripture affirmeth of it self, that it is able to make us wise unto salvation, and furnish us to every good work, and is written that we might believe, and believing might have life in Christs name, &c. *Job. 29. 31. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17.* Of which we have said somewhat in a short Determination of that Question by it self.

Arg. 2. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, by which the Apostles and the Churches in their days were saved: But by the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, now called Protestant, were the Apostles and the Churches in their dayes saved: therefore it is a safe way to salvation.

The Major with reasonable men needeth no proof. There is not many Religions but only one that are a safe way to Salvation : and that which the Apostles went in and the Churches in their dayes, is undoubtedly that one. God hath not since taken down that Religion and set up another, and made that way safe to us, which was unsafe to them.

The Minor is thus proved, The Apostles and Churches in their dayes were saved by that Religion which is contained or expressed in the holy Scriptures: But that is the same with this which is called the Protestant Religion. For proof whereof I refer you, and offer as abovesaid. Yeeld once that Scripture shall be the Rule to judge by, and the controversy will soon be ended betwixt us.

And I need not to say but these two things for proof of the point.

1. That their own Writers confess that the Affirmative or Positive part of our Religion, as it was here in *England* professed, was not against the word of God, contained in the holy Scriptures, only they told us that the Negatives were, of which we shall consider further anon.

2. As it is the great care of the Papists to keep the Scriptures from the people, accounting it the Original of Heresies to have them translated (as *Arboreus* and many expressly say) and burning men to ashes for reading the Scriptures, when God will burn them in Hell, if they obey them not (which they are not like to do without knowing them) so experience hath convinced them that where the reading of the Scriptures in a known tongue is but permitted, there doth our Religion most encrease, and Popery decay; so that if this one means were but per-

permitted, in *Spain* and *Italy* as it is whether they will or no in other parts, undoubtedly the Popes Kingdom would soon come down: I say, if they durst but permit men to read the Word of God in a known tongue. They know this well enough, or else they would never so torture poor Christians by the Inquisition for having a Bible in their houses. They have some humanity in them, as well as others: and therefore could never go so exceeding far beyond the Turke in Cruelty to Christians themselves, but that they know their whole cause and Kingdom is concerned in it, and if once Scripture get in, they are gone. In a word, multitudes of volumes have already proved that Scripture is against Popery.

Argu. 3. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, in which the Church in the three or four first Ages at least was saved: But the Church in the three or four first Ages at least was saved in that Catholike Christian Religion, which now is called the Reformed or Protestant Religion: Therefore this is a safe way to Salvation.

I mention not the former Ages as if all other following Ages had come to heaven by any other Religion, then the former; but 1. because in them alone there is a sufficient proof of the Major Proposition: None could be saved in it, especially not so many Ages of the purest times, if it were not a safe way. 2. Because some Popish Errors began among the worser sort of Ambitious, Superstitious Prelates to creep in betimes; and Popery it self appeared in the world soon after the six hundredth year, and was openly established about the thousandth year. And according to the degrees of corruption in the Church

Church there was a greater difficulty of salvation ; because more impediments : but still those that were saved, were all saved in and by the same Religion of the former Ages ; and if they were saved in any Corruption, yet not *By* it, but *from* it, or against it.

As for the proof of the Minor as it requireth a full volume of it self ; to produce the particular Testimonies of the Fathers for us , so is it already done in many Volumes : And because the continual clamor of the Papist, is, that Antiquity is on their side, I shall anon disprove them in the fundamental difference between them and us , in the following Disputation, about their pretended Sovereignty and Infallibility ; and in other particulars desire them to give some reasonable answer to what is already acknowledged by Bishop *Usher*, Dr *Field*, and many more of our Writers , before they expect we should regard their vain immodest pretences : And still let it be remembered that for all the Positive part of our Religion, they themselves cannot deny but that the Churches still held it. Our Religion is the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures ; and doubtless that was entertained by all the Churches ; and in that Religion they were saved.

Argu. 4. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, whose faithful Professors have a promise of Salvation made them by God in his holy word : But such is the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant : therefore it is a safe way to Salvation.

The Major cannot be denied : for God cannot lie, or break his promise. And the Minor is easily proved by parts. Our Religion is to believe all that

is in the Holy Scripture to be the true word of God, and more particularly we believe all the Articles of the Creed called the Apostles, the *Nicene Creed*, and that of *Athanasius*; with the Doctrine of the Sacraments of Baptisme and the Lords Supper, and we confesse that in a larger sence other sacred mysteries may be called Sacraments: we believe that every man must unfeignedly Repent of all sin, and turn from it to God, and Love God above all, and his neighbor as himself, and faithfully obey the whole revealed will of God; with other particulars which may be seen at large in our severall confessions. And he that faithfully Believeth and doth all this, hath many promises of Salvation in the Scripture, *John 3. 26* *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.* But Protestants believe in him; and subvert not, nor nullifie that belief by any contradiction; therefore they shall not perish (if they be true to their profession) but have everlasting life.

Mark. 16. 16 *Go and preach the Gospel to every creature: he that Believeth and is Baptized shall be saved.* But Protestants believe and are baptized. *Obj.* So Hereticks and wicked men may say. *Ans.* But not truly: For 1. Hereticks truly so called, that cannot be saved, do not Believe the whole Doctrine which is fundamental or of Absolute necessity to Salvation. Let them shew that by us if they can. 2. As Hereticks have not the true faith, so wicked men are not true in the faith: The former want the *fides quæ* & *quæ* both, that is, both true objective and subjective faith: and the later want true subjective faith at least. And so they will confesse

that many a Pope hath done.

Rom. 10. 9. *If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* For with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. But thus do the Protestants; therefore they shall be saved.

The Doctrine which *Peter* preached to *Cornelius* was sufficient to save him and all his house, *Act. 10. 14.* But every word of that is believed by the Protestants, therefore it may save them.

The Jaylor is promised, *Act. 16. 31.* that if he will believe on the Lord Jesus Christ he shall be saved. So *Heb. 10. 39.* *Luk. 8. 12.* It is not said, If you wilt believe in Christ and the Pope of Rome you shalt be saved, *Act. 4. 12.* [*Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved*] Therefore not the Popes name. In *Act. 15. 1.* it is said that certain men came down from *Judea* taught the brethren, that except they were circumcised after the manner of *Moses* they could not be saved: against these *Paul* wrote the Epistle to the *Galatians*, where you may see how to think of such: and in the like manner do the Papists teach men, that except they believe in the Pope of Rome, and except they believe that there is a Purgatory, and that Images may be worshiped, and that the consecrated host may be adored, and that we may pray to saints departed, and that the Priest must take the sacrament while the people only look on, and that only the Priest must receive it in both kinds, and the head alone may serve the people, and that prayers

and other Church-service should be in the Latine tongue when the people understand it not with abundance more of their vile inventions. I say, those that believe not all this, they say cannot be saved: But what say the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at *Jerusalem*, when the former case was brought before them? They would not have tempted God, by putting a yoke on the neck of the Disciples, but believe that through the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, those that used none of those ceremonies should be saved as well as the Jews, *Acts* 10, 11. And the sum of their Decrees or answer is that [Those men who went out from them and troubled people with such words, did but subvert the souls, by saying that they must be circumcised and keep the Law, and that they gave them no such commandment; and that it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and them to lay upon the Gentiles no greater burden than these necessary things, &c.] The Papists thus go out as from the Apostles, pretending an Apostolical Tradition, and impose upon the whole Christian world a multitude of Ceremonies and Doctrines as necessary to salvation, which are not to be found in the holy Scripture. How shall we know whether these men indeed have any commandment or Tradition from the Apostles for any such course? Why 1. Let them shew their Commission, and the proof of their Traditions. 2. We fully disprove them from the Apostles owne words. It seems good to the Holy Ghost and the Apostles to lay upon the Gentiles no greater burden then the necessary things here named; and by these they may be saved, and they that teach otherwise are pronounced by them, subverters of souls, that had

command from them for what they did. But it seemeth good to the Pope and his faction to lay on the Gentile Churches unnecessary things, and multitudes of them, pretending a necessity of them, when they are none of the four that are here only made necessary by the Apostles, nor are so made by any other word of Scripture; and some they impose in pain of damnation, which they will not pretend to be of necessity themselves. By proportion therefore we may hence judge, that the Papists are meer life pretenders to Apostolical Tradition, and subverters of souls, and that the Protestants may be saved for all their presumptuous sentence to the contrary.

The Gospel which *Paul* preached to the *Corinthians*, and which they received, was such as would save them, if they kept it in memory, viz. that Christ dyed for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, &c. as *Paul* witnesseth, 1 Cor. 15. 1, 2, 3, 4, and the *Corinthians* by the believe of this Doctrine, were a Church of God and sanctified, 1 Cor. 1. 1, 2. But the Protestants believe all that the *Corinthians* received to make them such a Church and sanctified and saved; Therefore the Protestants are so

John wrote his Gospel that men might believe, and believing might have life, *Joh.* 20. 30, 31. Therefore he that believeth that Gospel shall have life: But the Protestants believe all that Gospel; therefore they shall have life (supposing it to be a true faith that worketh by love.) The Jews that heard *Peters* sermon, *Act.* 2. were converted and added to the church (even three thousand souls) and put into a

state of Justification by Believing that Sermon, ver. 37, 38, 41, 46, 47. But the Protestants believe that *Peter* preached in that Sermon : therefore they also are of the Church and justified.

And least the Accusing Devil or Papists, should trouble the peace of any of his people, Christ hath protested it with his own mouth, *Joh. 5. 24* [*Verily, Verily I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life*] Me thinks this should make any believer tremble at the thoughts of condemning those that Christ hath protested shall not be condemned.

Christ hath promised that all those that receive his words, and in whom his words abide, shall be beloved of the Father and have everlasting life, and heard in what they aske, *Joh. 14. 23. & 15. 7*. Doubtless that which Christ himself preached was the true Gospel, and so far sufficient that whoever believed it shall be saved. Otherwise Christ could not have converted any soul, so far as to have brought them into a state of Salvation by his Doctrine : and the *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles were not true Christians by the belief of the Doctrine of Christ, but if the Doctrine which Christ preached be sufficient to make true Christians and Church-members, those that receive it, then the Protestants are sufficient. For, they believe every word that the Evangelists record of the Doctrine of Christ. And if the Papists say that there is more of his Doctrine necessary for salvation, which the Evangelists did not record in Scripture, 1. We call for their proof of it, and 2. We know that the Evangelists did purposely write the

our Gospels or Histories of Christ, of purpose to acquaint the world with his Nature, Birth, Life, doctrine, death and Resurrection, &c. *Luke* professeth that he wrote his Gospel upon perfect understanding of all things from the very first, which conteyneth a Declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they were delivered by them that from the beginning were eyeWitnesses and Ministers of the Word, *Luk*, 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. And he tells us *Act*, 1, 2. that he wrote his Gospel of all things that Jesus began both to do and teach, untill the day in which he was taken up. It would therefore have been an exceeding blemish to the Evangelists, that wrote of set purpose both the History of Christs life and Doctrine, if they had left out any part of it that was of necessity to salvation. Protestants therefore that believe all the Gospel do believe so much as may bring them safely to salvation. If Christ himself be not a sufficient Teacher, nor the Gospel it self a sufficient Doctrine of Life, Then, whither shall we go to seek it? Then *Peter* himself was not the Rock, nor a true Christian by Christs Teaching: And then the Pope could not derive that from *Peter* which he had not. But *Peter* himself thought and taught otherwise. He saith [*Lord whether shall we go? we know that thou hast the words of Eternal Life*] For my part I will take *Peters* counsel, and go to Christ for the words of Eternal Life, which are purposely recorded by four Evangelists in the Gospel. Let who will go to the Pope for another Gospel, to supply the supposed defects of this, for I will not.

In *Act*, 22. & 26. and other places *Paul* preacheth so much of the Gospel, as might have made true

Believers, and all that, the Protestants receive.

The Church of *Rome* when *Paul* wrote his Epistle to them, were a true Church, *Rom.* 1. 7. and all the Doctrine that *Paul* writeth to them we do believe.

Paul telleth the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Act.* 20. 27. that he had not shunned to declare to them the whole counsel of God: and this is summed up in [*Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ*] *vers.* 21. And whatsoever *Paul* hath written to these *Ephesians* or any other Churches or persons, we believe.

But what should we talk any more with such an arrogant unreasonable sort of men, that dare maintain that the belief of all the Holy Scripture is not large enough to salvation. Atheists and Infidels say of the Scripture, that it is too big to be all true: And Papists say that it is not big enough to bring a man to heaven that believeth and obeyeth it. Shall the Holy Ghost endite a Volume as big as the Bible, and when he hath done shall any pretending to be Christians, perswade the world that he that believeth all this, shall be damned if he believe not the closet-Traditions which the *Romane* Bishop pretendeth to be the keeper of?

Nay see the strange contradictions of this giddy faction! They lock up this Scripture it self from the common people in an unknown tongue: They damne the translating of it as the root of all Heresies, and burn men to ashes for using the Bible; when they cannot keep it unknown any longer, they translate it themselves as far as they can to their own advantage, and put it forth with their perverting Annotations; and yet when they have all done, they condemne any that

that read it without a special licence from their Ordinary : which in *England* and *France* they sometime grant to avoid suspicions ; but in *Spain*, *Italy*, &c. too few if any at all. And when they have written voluminously to prove that the Scriptures are not necessary to the people for salvation, and that Ignorance is the mother of devotion, they come back again, and dispute against the Protestants, that the whole Scripture is not sufficient to salvation, and he that believes but the Scriptures is not in a safe way to salvation. It seems then that the Popes Canons are more necessary then the Scripture : For a man may be saved without the knowledge of Scripture, but not without the knowledge of the Canons of the Pope : Yes, that he may too : if some of them mistake not, if they will but implicitly believe that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholike Church, and that the Pope is the infallible sovereign of the Christian world, and believe some Articles of the Creed upon his credit, he may be saved without either Scripture or Canons, so he be but ready to believe and obey whatever shall be offered to him by the Pope for the time to come.

Moreover Christ and his Apostles do frequently promise Remission and salvation to all that truly Repent ; that love God in Christ, that mortifie the flesh, &c. but all this do the Protestants, and their Religion teacheth them to do it. *Paul* concludeth that, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh but after the spirit.* Rom. 8. 1. But the Protestants are in Christ Jesus, and their Religion teacheth and engageth them so to walk : therefore there is no condemnation to them (that do so) and they may with
the

the same Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. Challenge all the Papists in the world. It is God that justifieth, who shall condemne us?

Paul telleth *Timothy* that the holy Scriptures are able to make him wise to salvation, *2 Tim.* 3. 15, therefore they may make us also wise to salvation. And he addeth, that [*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works,*] *verl.* 16, 17. It were endless to recite all that proveth the salvation of them that believe and obey the holy Scriptures. But this all true Protestants do. I shall therefore leave this taske, and next hear what the Papists can say to the contrary, and what they are able to produce to prove that we are not in a safe way to salvation.

Obj. 1. There is but one safe way to Heaven; The Protestant Religion is not that one way: Therefore not a safe way. The Minor is proved thus: That Religion which the Church hath owned from the Apostles dayes till now, is that one way: The Protestant Religion is not that which the Church hath so owned: therefore it is not that one Religion. The Minor is proved by parts, 1. As to Doctrine, 2. as to Discipline, 3. as to worship. 1. The Church ever since the Apostles dayes, hath maintained the Doctrines of, 1. Free-will to good or evil, 2. of Predestination upon foreseen faith, 3. of mans merits, 4. of Justification by Inherent Grace, 5. against the certain Perseverance of all the Justified, and consequently against their certainty of salvation 6. Vow.

6. Vowed Chastity and Monastical Life. In Discipline the Church ever held, 1. The Popes Supremacy and Universal Jurisdiction; 2. The Government by Bishops over Presbyters: 3. Ordination by them, and not without them. 4. Penance and Confession of sin. 3. In matter of Worship the Church hath still used, 1. Chrisme to the Baptized. 2. Imposition of hands in confirmation. 3. The sacrifice of the Altar. 4. The Cross. 5. Holy dayes. 6. Fasting dayes. All which the Protestants have cast off: Therefore they are not, of the same Religion.

Ans^r. 1. To the Major Proposition of the main Argument, I answer. The word [*safe*] referreth to some Danger that we are safe from: The way may be called safe therefore, either in respect of sin or damnation: Also this way may be called [*one*] in respect of the Essentials of Religion, or else in respect of some inferior truths and duties, that are not of absolute necessity to salvation. And so I say that there is but one Religion as to the Essential and absolutely necessary points, in which a man can be safe from Damnation. And there is but one Religion as comprehending all the Integral parts, in which a man can be safe from sin: But yet that Religion which in the Essentials and Absolutely necessary points is but one, may yet consist with errors in lower and lesser things in the minds of those that hold it; and yet be a safe way to salvation, though not so safe as to freemen from all sin. And consequently there may be differences among true Christians that shall be saved, though there be nothing but perfect Harmony in the entire Doctrine

Doctrine of Christian Religion as delivered from Christ and his Spirit: Because no man holds that Doctrine entirely and perfectly without any error or ignorance, and therefore there will be much difference among those that shall be saved. To the Major of the Pro-syllogisme, I answer, Implicitely and in Generals the Church hath owned the perfect truth in all ages, because it hath Believed that all that God saith is true, and that the Scripture is his word: But explicately and particularly the Church hath not held all the truth of Religion, in any one age since the Apostles. For every man on earth hath been Ignorant, and the most knowing men erroneous in some things: seeing we are all imperfect, and here know but in part. And so one particular Church might erre in one thing, and another in another thing, as the differences about Easter, Rebaptizing, the Millennium, Infants Communicating, &c. shew they did. And of the same Church one Member might erre in one thing and another in another thing: it being as certain that no two men on the earth are in all things of the same minde, as that none on earth are perfect in knowledge. To the Minor I answer, that the Religion called Protestant is the same in all points absolutely necessary so salvation which the Church hath still owned: And in other inferior points, the Churches having not been all or alwayes of one minde, some ages were more pure, and others more corrupt: The Protestant Religion is nearer to that of the purer times then the Papists is; It is the same in the Essentials; it is the nearest it in the Integrals; it is more remote from latter corruptions introduced in times more remote from the Apostolical purity.

To the particular instances of our differences from the former Churches, I answer particularly. 1. For Free will to God, if you mean a natural freedome, which is [the wills self-determining Power] so the Protestants maintain it as well as the Fathers. If you mean a moral freedom from ill-inclining habits, which is properly a right-disposition, so the Fathers maintained it not.

Obj. Let *Scultetus in Medulla Patrum* and others of your own Writers be judge who still number this *inter novos Patrum*.

Ans. *Scultetus* and *Calvin* and others might mistake the Fathers sence and think that they spoke of moral Freedom, when they spoke but of natural, which is inseparable from the will. And its like that they did so, seeing the Fathers maintained Original sin, which is that pravity of humane nature, which is clean contrary to moral Free-will. 2. And if the Fathers were for a Free-will in a moral-Ethical sence, so is one part of the Protestants as much as they were. And if they were in the right, so are those Protestants? If in the wrong then the other part of the Protestants are in this, in the right. 3. This is a point that men may differ in, as much as the Fathers did from us, and yet be in a safe way to salvation. 4. The Dominicans and the Jesuites differ about it as much as we and the Fathers; yea, they cannot yet agree, what natural free-

will is. 2. For Predestination upon foreseen faith.

* 1. There is no Declaration of the Churches

seen unbelieve; and others being for Predestination (i. e. Election) upon foreseen faith.

* In this the Ancients differed among themselves *Austin* and his followers being for absolute Predestination and for Reprobation upon fore-

minde

Doctrine of Christian Religion as delivered from Christ and his Spirit: Because no man holds that Doctrine entirely and perfectly without any error or ignorance, and therefore there will be much difference among those that shall be saved. To the Major of the Pro-syllogisme, I answer, Implicitely and in Generals the Church hath owned the perfect truth in all ages, because it hath Believed that all that God saith is true, and that the Scripture is his word: But explicately and particularly the Church hath not held all the truth of Religion, in any one age since the Apostles. For every man on earth hath been Ignorant, and the most knowing men erroneous in some things: seeing we are all imperfect, and here know but in part. And so one particular Church might erre in one thing, and another in another thing, as the differences about Easter, Rebaptizing, the Millennium, Infants Communicating, &c. shew they did. And of the same Church one Member might erre in one thing and another in another thing: it being as certain that no two men on the earth are in all things of the same minde, as that none on earth are perfect in knowledge. To the Minor I answer, that the Religion called Protestant is the same in all points absolutely necessary to salvation which the Church hath still owned: And in other inferior points, the Churches having not been all or alwayes of one minde, some ages were more pure, and others more corrupt: The Protestant Religion is nearer to that of the purer times then the Papists is: It is the same in the Essentials; it is the nearest it in the Integrals; it is more remote from latter corruptions introduced in times more remote from the Apostolical purity.

To the particular instances of our differences from the former Churches, I answer particularly. 1. For Free will to God, if you mean a natural freedom, which is [the wills self-determining Power] so the Protestants maintain it as well as the Fathers. If you mean a moral freedom from ill-inclining habits, which is properly a right-disposition, so the Fathers maintained it not.

Obj. Let *Sculterus in Medulla Patrum* and others of your own Writers be judge who still number this *inter navos Patrum*.

Ans. *Sculterus* and *Calvin* and others might mistake the Fathers sense and think that they spoke of moral Freedom, when they spoke but of natural, which is inseparable from the will. And its like that they did so, seeing the Fathers maintained Original sin, which is that pravity of humane nature, which is clean contrary to moral Free-will. 2. And if the Fathers were for a Free-will in a moral-Ethical sense, so is one part of the Protestants as much as they were. And if they were in the right, so are those Protestants? If in the wrong then the other part of the Protestants are in this, in the right. 3. This is a point that men may differ in, as much as the Fathers did from us, and yet be in a safe way to salvation. 4. The Dominicans and the Jesuites differ about it as much as we and the Fathers; yea, they cannot yet agree, what natural free-

will is. 2. For Predesti-

* 1 There is no Decla-
ration of the Churches

seen unbe ief; and others being for Predestination (i. e. Ele-
Aion) upon foreseen faith.

* In this the Ancients differ-
ed among themselves *Austin*
and his followers being for
absolute Predestination and
for Reprobation upon fore-

minde

minde in those times about it, but what is found in the writings of particular Doctors. 2. We confess that men are Elected to Glory and Justification from guilt, upon foreseen faith: But we say withall that they are Elected to that faith; and that God did foresee it as a thing which he intended to give, and not as a thing which corrupted unregenerate nature would produce. 3. And we say also, that this is a point that men may differ in that yet are in a safe way to salvation.

3. As to the point of mans merits, we say; that the Fathers differed from us but in word and not indeed: It seemed good to them to call every moral aptitude or Ordination *ad Premium*, that is, the Rewardableness of our actions, by the name of merit; and every Rewardable work meritorious. We thinke it fittest to forbear this name. This Verbal difference makes not two distinct Religions.

4. As to the point of Justification, we confess that the Fathers commonly called that Justification which we now call Sanctification. And we our selves maintain that Sanctification doth consist in Inherent Graces. This difference therefore being but verbal, the Religion and the way to salvation is nevertheless the same.

* *Austin, Prosper Fulgentius, &c* fully maintain the Perseverance of all the Elect, though not of all the Justified.

5. As for the points of * Perseverance and certainty of Salvation, and Virginity or vowed Chastity, with the supposed merit thereof, and of a Monastical or Eremetical life; we think that most of the Churches since the first century, have departed from the Apostles Doctrine in these points;
and

and therefore we appeal to the Scripture. But yet we know that these are not points of absolute necessity to salvation; so that whether those Churches, or we were mistaken, yet is our Religion the same, and both they, and we in a safe way to Heaven.

2. For matters of Government and Discipline we say 1. That we undertake to manifest it as cleare as the light; that the Popes Supreme Headship, and universal jurisdiction, is a novelty introduced above six hundred years after Christ. 2. For Diocesane Episcopacy and their ordination, some of the Reformed Churches do own it: But it is not a matter so necessary to Salvation, as that all men that will be saved must needs be of one minde in it. 3. We confess and maintain the necessity of true Penitence and such confession of sin as is necessary to manifest Penitence to the Church after a notorious scandal: and of confession to those that we have wronged: and of private confession to our Pastors, in case that we cannot have a through cure of our wounds, or comfort to our consciences without it. Lastly, as for the Ceremonies mentioned which the former Churches used, and as for the bare name of a Sacrifice and Altar (while they agreed with us in sence) we take them not to be matters of so great moment, as must make them and us of two Religions; as if both were not in a safe way to salvation. The best men on earth may differ in as great a matter as one of these: and if they in a mistaken zeal shall depart from the Apostles, so that we cannot imitate both the Apostles and them, we had rather of the two leave them then the Apostles; yet holding with them still in the maine.

Obj. The Religion of Protestants differs from the Abassine and Greek Churches and all the world as well as the *Romane*, and therefore cannot be a safe way. *Ans.* 1. If that be not a safe way which differs from the Greeks, Abassines, &c. then the Papists way is much less safe then ours: for they do not onely differ from them, but un-Church them and condemne them to Hell, and so do not we. 2. We are of the same Religion with them: onely we have by Gods great mercy cast out of that one way some stones of offence, which they have not yet cast out.

Obj. 2. The true safe Religion hath had a visible Church professing it from Christs time till this day: But the Protestant Religion hath not had a visible Church, professing it to this day: therefore it is not the true safe Religion.

Ans. The Major I easily grant and disclaim the needless shift of them that would deny it. But the Minor I deny: If they call for the proof of that visible Church, and aske where it was before *Luther*, we say that it was wherever Christ had a Church: From Christs time till many hundred years after, even at *Rome* it self and many other places: and from Christs time to this day it hath been in *Ethiopia*, *Greece*, *Egypt*, *Mesopotamia*, and many other Countries, if not still among the *Romanists* themselves: for full proof of which, note, that it is from the
Essentials,

Essentials, and points of great necessity, that we denominate our Religion; and every difference in lesser things doth not make a distinct Religion: else there were as many Religions in the world as men. Note also that the main difference between us and the Papists is, not that they deny the substance of our Religion directly, but that they superadde a great many of new Articles to the old Creed, and have made their Religion much larger then ours, many of their new Articles consequently subverting the Fundamentals which they profess. So that our Religion is, and still hath been among the Papists, and other Churches: and if they adde more to it, that makes it not cease in it self to be what it was. Our Religion is wholly contained in the Holy Scriptures, and that all the Churches have still allowed of: The Papists themselves confess it all to be the Word of God, which we appeal to as the onely Touch-stone and rule of our faith.

Obj. So you would make our Religion and yours to be all one. *Ans.* As the word Religion signifieth the Essentials of the Christian Faith; or the points of absolute necessity to Salvation; so our Religion is with you, and is owned or confessed by you: As it signifieth all those points that are *concris-* necessary to Salvation with the professors, so your Religion is not all, but part, with us: And as it comprehendeth also all those Integral parts, which a man may confessedly be saved without, so he do not wilfully reject them, so yours and ours do much differ: And that your Religion is not all with us is no loss to us; because the points of yours which we disown are both novel additions of your own brain, and all such as contradict the acknowledged verities.

D

Where.

Wherever then Christ had a Church that did believe all the Doctrine of the Scripture, and specially the Creed, the Lords Prayer, the Decalogue, the Doctrine of the new Covenant, Baptisme, the Lords Supper, and the Ministry, there was our Religion before *Luther*: If any added hay and stubble, if the work be burnt, and they suffer loss, yet our Religion among them is the same still.

Obj. But do not you make this Negative a part of your Religion; that nothing but Scripture is to be believed *fide divinâ*? and what Church was of this Opinion?

Ans. 1. We have oft at large shewed that many of the ancient Doctors of the Church have asserted the Scriptures sufficiency at large, and appealed to them as the full Revelation of Gods will concerning all things necessary to salvation, and the sufficient Rule to Judge of controversies. 2. If they did not of them think that the Church had a superadded Revelation by Tradition, in points of order, of necessity to salvation; this doth not make them to be of two Religions, or wayes of Salvation as long as they do not introduce any dangerous or destructive points under that pretence.

Obj. But the Church still held those things necessary to Salvation which you deny. *Ans.* I deny that to be true: Some of the points in difference are novelties of your own, which the ancient Church did never hold: the rest are such as they never put such a stress, as mens salvation upon.

To conclude, Let it be considered whether this Argument may not damne your selves which I use against you Thus. The true safe Religion hath no visible Church professing it from Christs time

But the Religion of the *Romanists* (as comprehending all points of their faith, or made by them to be necessary to salvation) hath not had any visible Church professing it of many hundred years after Christ: Therefore it is not the true Religion, nor a way to salvation, The Minor I shall undertake to make good: And our Divines have done it already.

No doubt but common reason and justice require, that you that call to us so earnestly for a Catalogue of the Professors of our Religion in all Ages should be as much obliged your selves to give us a Catalogue of yours: yea and to give it first, because you are the first in pleading the necessity of it. Undertake this task therefore, and perform it well, and you shall carry the whole cause. Give us a Catalogue of any, besides impeached Hereticks, that did in your main points of Popery for many hundred years after Christ, and we will give you a full account of such as contradicted those conceits and beliefs as we do, and let both be compared together, and let the most satisfaction and the fullest evidence cry it. You make a meer empty noise among the garb of Antiquity and Universality, and call for proof of the perpetual or continued visibility of the Church, as if in this you had the advantage, if the ballance did turn on your side: When as though we know that there is no such necessity of proof in this as you pretend yet) we know your advantage here to be so great, that if you will be perswaded to this way of tryal, it will be to the utter shame and confusion of your cause. Whats the matter else that you still appeal to the latter or present Church, and that is only to the *Romans*, and thats

onely to your selves? If we do but invite you to tryal by Scripture, and the Fathers and Records of the three first ages, you presently scorn the more, and fall upon the Fathers with accusations, as if they had not understood or believed all that was necessary to salvation, or to the being of a Christian or Church; for you say they did not meddle with the controversies; and so you call us down to the late or present times, as having equal authority with the first; To which we say, 1. That the silence of the first times concerning these matters, if there were no more (as yet there is) is sufficient to prove that they were not then taken for any necessary points of faith. For, Though our Records of the second Age be very short, yet both they and many more those of the third and fourth Ages containe such purposely undertaken, explications of the Christian faith, that we cannot imagine such multitude of necessary points would have been omitted. 2. And though the Pastors of the present Age have equal Authority in Ruling their Congregations with those of the second, yet they cannot give us sure account what was the doctrine and practice of the former Ages, nor any way prove it to us by producing such records.

The Papiſts themselves are so far from denying that the Ancient Fathers and Churches did hold the Positive part of our Religion, that they hold it themselves; For they themselves profess to believe the book of holy Scripture that we do: They say they believe the Creed called the Apostles, and the *Nice* and *Constantinopolitan* Creed, and that of *Thanasius*; and so do we (still taking the holy Scripture onely for our Rule) so that their own con-

must confess the Antiquity, and Universality, and
 succession of our Religion: For this is ours.

But all that they have to object is this, That we
 name no Churches or Fathers that held our
Negatives. To which I say, 1. The *Negatives*
 at least, for the most part of them, if not all) are
 the meer consequences of the Affirmatives and Posi-
 tives, and implied or plainly included in them: For
 example, when our Religion saith [*Thou shalt wor-
 ship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*]
 this includeth the Negative [*Thou shalt*

not worship or serve Saints, Angels or Mat. 4. 10.
 any other, save only by a service and honour duely
 subservient to the service and worship of God: and
 therefore that we give not Divine worship to the
 consecrated host, or the Virgin *Mary*, or to any
 other meer creature. Our Religion teacheth us [to
 do all things to edifying] 1 Cor. 14. 26. This includ-
 eth the negatives [that we must not worship God in
 an unknown tongue or unedifying manner, bleating
 and bellowing out our prayers in hideous or ridicu-
 lous tones.] Our Religion maketh it the Ministerial
 Commission, to teach the Nations and Baptize,
Mat. 28. 19, 20. This includeth the Negative that
 women or lay men should not so teach (that is, as
 Commissioned officers) nor baptize:

This affirmative [*Peter was sent to Dis-* Mat. 28. 19.
 tiple Nations] includeth this Negative [*Peter was*
 not sent to be the fixed Bishop of *Rome*, and there
 to reside. This affirmative [The Apostles are the
 Foundation of the Church] includeth this negative
 [*Peter alone is not the Foundation of the Church*]
 This Affirmative [It is bread and wine which we take
 and eat and drink in the Eucharist] containeth or im-
 ply-

plyeth the Negative, that [It is not Christs flesh and blood, which the bread and wine is transubstantiated into] I might thus instance in many more: Our Neg-

atives are contained or implied in our Affirmatives which you hold or confesse your selves.

So Dr. *White* confesseth that we cannot bring a Catalogue of those that in all ages have maintained our Negations of their corruptions, because the Corrupters were then risen up; and how should we prove that the Church proposed an error before it was hatched.

2. I answer further, that we have expresse negatives also both in Scriptures and Fathers, in the main points of difference between us and the Papists. We have a plain [*Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, &c. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them, &c.*] We have a plaine [In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue] (unknown) 1 Cor. 14. 19. We have a plain [See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant] *Rev.* 22. 9. And so of the chief differences through the rest.

3. If we had but this one point proved, that [the holy Scripture is a sufficient Rule of Faith] it fully warranteth all our Negatives wherein we differ from the Papists. For, to Believe all that is in Scripture, and that this is sufficient, will surely warrant as to exclude their additions. And we have oft proved that the first ages did maintain the Scripture sufficiency. This one answer doth fully justifie us against this evil of the Papists. The Ancient Church and Fathers believed the Scripture and the sufficiency of that Scripture as containing all points of faith: And so do

ve. And so all Popish faith is excluded (Though we confess many Ceremonies and points of order were then admitted as from the Church.)

4. Negatives became necessary to be expressly asserted by occasion of Heresies. And therefore who can wonder if many of them are never mentioned till those heresies did call them out. When there was no man so impudent as to say that [The Pope of Rome is the Universal Bishop and Governor of the whole Church] or that [God must be worshipped in an unknown tongue] or that [Images must be worshipped] who could expect that the Church should have occasion in words to express it as a part of their faith that [The Pope is not the universal Bishop; not infallible, &c.] and so of the rest? If Popery had risen sooner, it had sooner been contradicted.

5. There may be an hundred Negatives made necessary hereafter by heresies, which it is not necessary now to put into our Creed or confessions, because they are not yet sufficiently contained or implied in the contrary Affirmatives. If Hereticks arise that say that man hath seven souls; that the soul returns to be Gods Essence, and was so eternally; that there are fourteen Sacraments; that Infants must take Orders; with a hundred the like; then it might be necessary for us expressly to deny these; and shall they then tell us that our Religion is new and theirs old, because we cannot prove that any did before deny theirs? So what if we could not prove that any before had said [The Pope is not the Universal Governor?] that is because there was none so shameless for six hundred years as to say he was. Whose Religion then is proved new by this, ours or theirs?

But I shall say somewhat more to this anon in the end.

Obj. 3. That Religion which cannot be known having no certain test to discern it by, can be no way to salvation: But such is the Reformed Religion, therefore, &c. The Minor is proved: If they have any such test, either 'it is Scripture, or some confessions of their own: But neither of these therefore not Scripture: For that is appealed to by many Religions, and therefore can be no proper Test to discern one of them from the rest: Besides it knows not so much as the name of the *Reformed Protestant Religion*: Not any confession: for they have no one which they agree in, but one disclaimeth what another owneth: And they have none agreed on by a General Council, or by all themselves.

Ans. 1. The Test of our Religion is the holy Scripture; This we profess joyntly to be the Rule of our faith and life: To this we still Appeal, If we misunderstand it in any point, we implicitly renounce all such errors; because we explicitly in general renounce all that is contrary to the Scripture. This may be the true Test of our Religion though others falsely pretend that theirs is more agreeable to it. Many things may be tryed by the same Touchstone, and weighed by the same ballance; whereof some may be currant; and others unsound, or light. May not the Law of the Land be the true Rule of our obedience to our Governors, though the Rebellious or disobedient should pretend to be Ruled by the same Laws.

2. They

2. They are not all distinct Religions which the Papists call so: Many appeal to the same Scriptures, who agree in the maine concerning the sence, and disagree onely in some inferior things. These are not several Religions.

3. Our confessions do shew how we understand the Scripture; wherein we agree in the main, as the Harmony of Confessions testifieth, though in some lesser things we differ.

Obj. 4. They that have causlessly separated from all the Churches in the world are not of the true Religion nor in a safe way to Salvation: But so have the Protestants done: for they are divided both from *Romane Church*, the *Greeks*, *Abassines*, *Armenians*, and all: therefore they are not in a safe way.

Ans. Its one thing to withdraw from some corruption of a Church and another to withdraw from the Church. 1. We that are now living did not withdraw from *Rome* or any of the rest: for we were never among you or under you. 2. Our Fathers withdrew not from the Church as Christian or Catholic-like, but from the particular corruptions of the *Romane* faction, in Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship; rejecting their lately usurped Tyranny, by which they would have still obliged them to sin against God. As we are commanded to withdraw from each particular Brother that walketh disorderly, so must we from a particular Church when they will be so disordered, as to Tyrannize over the universal. 3. The Church of *Rome* rejected us by a causeless excommunica-

nication, who were not *de jure* under her power.
 4. We still profess our selves of the same Church with the *Greeks, Abassines, Arminians, Coptes*, and all others on earth that hold the Scriptures, and that so hold the Antient Creeds or fundamentals of Christianity; as that they do not evidently subvert it again by contradictory Errors: If they hold no Errors but what may consist with a true belief of the Fundamentals in the same persons (though by an unseen consequence they may contradict them) we separate not from that Church so as to disclaim it from being a true Church: And therefore its not true that we so separate from all the world: but as to the Local Personal Communion or presence, we do not joyn with the truest Church in the least known sin: But in that respect we cannot be said to separate from the *Greeks or Abassines*, that we have no opportunity of Local Communion with. While all men are imperfect, one may see that Error which another seeth not: and to separate meerly from a sin of one man or a Church is not simply to separate from the man or Church.

Obj. 5. That Religion which hath no unity in itself or consistency, but is broken into many Sects, and still running further, is no safe way to salvation. But such is the Protestant Religion, therefore.

Ans. We deny the Minor. Our Religion is one, simply one, and most consistent, and having one sure standing Rule, not subject to changes as yours is; even the word of God himself. The same

same Rule that the first Churches had, and the same Test by which the Christian Religion was known of old, when the Belief of the Scripture, and particularly the Ancient Creeds, and the actual Communion with the true Church, was the test of a Catholike, the one in Doctrine, the other in Communion; as freeing him from Schismes. We believe all the same Articles, and we divide not from the Catholick Church. If any depart from Scriptures as to the sense in points absolutely necessary; they cease to be of our Religion. If any depart from it in lesser things, they may yet be of the same Religion with us; but so far we disown them, if we know it. Popery hath no, sure test, or means to prevent mutation. But we have in that we fix on the Immutable Rock. If Anabaptists, Separatists, or any erroneous persons live among us, so far as they hold those errors, so far they are none of us: And if any err, whom we dare not reject, we yet reject their errors, and take them for no part of our Religion. And if this Argument hold, it will much more condemne the Romanists, who have more diversity of opinions and wayes among them then the Protestants, as may in due place be shewed.

Obj. 6. That is not the true Religion nor a safe way to Heaven, which men can have no Infallible certainty of. But the Protestant Religion is such: For they all profess their Church to be fallible.

Ans. We must distinguish between a man that May be deceived, and a man that Is deceived: And be-

between Infallibility in the Object, and in the Subject or Intellect. And between Infallibility in the absolutely necessary points, and in some Inferior smaller matters. And so I *Ans.* 1. The Rule of our Religion, *viz.* the word of God, is Infallible, yea the onely Infallible Rule of Religion: and therefore we have an Infallible, and the onely Infallible Religion. 2. The weakness of the Recipient must be differenced from the Religion which hath no such weakness. There is still the certainty and Infallibility of the Object, when the believer through his own weakness may be uncertain. 3. No man is *Falsu* actually deceived, while he believes that doctrine of our Religion, that is, the holy Scripture: And this we are certain of. 4. No Christian in *sensu composito*, nor no Church is fallible, or can err in the Fundamentals or points absolutely necessary. For if he do so, he ceaseth to be a Christian, and that to be a Church. 5. In *sensu diviso*, he that was a common believer, may Apostatize from the faith, and so may a particular Church: and therefore is fallible, but is not, as is said, Deceived, till it turn from the Infallible truth. 6. The best man or Church on earth doth know but in part, and therefore erreth in part, and therefore is fallible in part or in lower things. So that it is not the least proof of the fallibility of Scripture or the Reformed Religion, that men may Apostatize from it, or that they may stagger in Believing an Infallible Truth, or that we are fallible in lesser things. All true Believers are actually Infallibly perswaded of the Truth of Gods Word, and particularly of all things absolutely necessary.

sed non in eo quod est obiectum sed in eo quod est subiectum Obj.

Obj. 7. That Religion is not true nor a safe way to heaven which wanteth many Articles of faith; But the Protestant Religion wanteth many Articles of faith: Therefore.

Ans. 1. We must distinguish of our Religion as it is in the Professed Rule, and as it is Impressed in the mindes of men: In the former respect, we say that our Religion wanteth no Article of faith: for Gods perfect Word is our Religion: But in the minds of men Religion is more or less imperfect according to the strength or weakness of mens faith.

2. We must distinguish between true Articles of Faith, and false ones made by the Church of Rome, We are without the latter (but want them not) but we expect that they who call them Articles of faith, do prove them so.

Obj. 8. Your Religion is unsafe by your own Testimony: You condemne one another: the *Lutheran* condemneth the *Calvinist* as Blasphemous, impious, and damnable: the *Calvinists* condemn the *Lutherans*: the *Anabaptists* both: and every sect is condemned by others: Therefore.

Ans. 1. The Churches confessions pass no such condemnation; nor any moderate sober men. 2. If two children fall out, & call one another Bastard, they are never the more Bastards for that, nor will the father

father therefore call them so; else what will become of your Jesuites and Dominicans.

Obj. 9. The very name of *Lutherans, Calvinists, Protestants*, do plainly express a Sect or party, different from the Name [*Catholike*] which denoteth the true Church which only holds the true Religion: And the very name [*Reformed*] is novel, and no proper title of the Catholike Church, but onely a cloak for your Schisme, which discloseth the novelty of your Church and way.

Answ. 1. And of how much better signification think you, is the name [*Papist*] or [*Romanist*]? You call your selves Catholikes, and we call our selves Catholikes: You scornfully call us *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists* which are names that we disclaime, and then argue from your own imposed names. Would you have us do so by you? And as for the names of *Protestants*, and *Reformed*, we use them not to express the Essential nature of our Religion, but the Accidental Removal of your Corruptions. So that though Scripture or Antiquity talke not of [*A Protestant, or Reformed Religion*] by name, yet it commendeth to us that same Religion, which we now call [*Protestant, or Reformed*] but then it could not so be called, because you had not then hatched your corruptions and deformities, which are presupposed to our Reformation. The man that fell among thieves, when his wounds were healed, was a [*Cured man*] whereas before he was not a cured man, because not a wounded man: And yet

he was the same man as before; and the Theeves
 that wounded him would have made but a foolish
 plea, if they would have dispossessed him of his In-
 heritance on pretence that he is not the same man;
 and have proved him not the same, because he hath
 not the same nature, it being not a Cured man that
 owned that inheritance before.

Obj. 10. Where the Catholike Church is, there
 the Catholike Religion is, and no where else: But
 the Catholike Church is not with you, but with us.
 For, you found us in Possession of the name and thing
 and then departed from us as Hereticks in former
 ages did from the Church: Therefore it is not you
 but we that have the true Catholike Religion, which
 is the onely safe way to salvation.

Ans. 1. The Church must be known to be true
 and Catholike by the Religion which it owneth, and
 not the Religion by the Church. You begin at the
 wrong end: As if I would prove such a thing to be a
 Vertue because it is in such a man, as I esteem, when
 I should rather prove him to be honest and Virtuous,
 because that which is first, proved honesty, & Vertue
 dwelleth in him. 2. Did we not find the *Greek*, &
Ethiopian and other Churches in possession of the name
 of the Catholike Church as well as you? Yet you
 would dispossess them. 3. We found you in Possessi-
 on of *All* in your own account: and all is yours if
 your selves must be Judges. But in the account of the
Greek, *Abussine* and other Churches we found you in
 Possession but of the name of [A Church] and not
 [The

[The Church] a Part of the Church Catholike, and not the whole; a Corrupt part and not the Head, or the Purest part. 4. We departed not from you as Church, much less as the Catholike Church, but as corrupted: Nor do we yet deny you to be a Church but to be a sound Church or the Catholike Church.

Concerning this and the former Queries, especially [when our Church was in all Ages before Luther] we shall clear our selves by giving the true state of the case, which will Justifie it self.

Christ came to be the Physician of diseased souls. In his Gospel he proclaimeth his office, and call them to himself for cure, and prescribeth them the means: But he takes the time of this life for the accomplishing it, and cureth no man perfectly to death. His Church therefore is as an Hospital or City so infected, that there is not one in it that is perfectly sound: One of the deepest radical diseases is Pride, which corrupted the blood even of the Apostles themselves. So far that it broke out into such an Itch, that they could not forbear contending who should be the greatest even in the presence of Christ himself. He derides the controversie, telling them [with you it shall not be so, but he that will be great shall be the servant of all.]. This disease of Pride was still alive in part, even where ever it was mortified, so that such like desires of Superiority were excited by it also in the Apostles successors, the Pastors of the Church in following ages. But it came but to a troublesome Itch till *Constantines* times. For the nailes of Persecution did so claw it, that the corrupt blood was let out, and the Itch was frequently abated by the smart: But when *Constantine* lifted

up the Bishops with honors, renew, and the ad-
 junction of secular power to their wills or censures,
 when the itch turned to a plain Scab; the corrupt
 blood continuing, and the scarifying scratches of
 persecution ceasing. But this overspread not the
 whole body, the Catholike Church much less all-
 aike: but it seized mainly upon the Clergy who
 should have been examples of humility and self-de-
 nial to the rest: And principally on the Clergy
 of the *Romane* Empire, and some others that they
 infected: But on none so much as the Bishop of
Rome, and his Clergys. For *Rome* being the Imper-
 rial seat, and drawing to it the glory, riches, and
 observance of the world, the Bishop of that place
 must needs be accordingly magnified and observed:
 especially because that he being at the Emperors ear
 might have pleased or displeased almost any
 Prince or Prelate in the Empire. At last by translation
 of much of the Glory to *Constantinople*, the heat of
 the disease was conveyed thither too, so that *John* of
Constantinople and *Gregory* of *Rome*, contended a-
 bout the Universal Supremacy: *John* laid the first
 claime to it, because he was Bishop of the Imperial
 seat. *Gregory* laies no claime to it himself, but con-
 tradicteth *John*, pronouncing it a note of Antichrist
 to claim the title of Universal Bishop, little think-
 ing that his own successors would have claimed it so
 soon. At last *Phocas* being helped by the *Romane*
 Bishop to possess the throne of his murdered Prince,
 doth help the Pope to the Title of Universal Bishop;
 and the glory and strength of *Constantinople* abating;
Rome did the more easily hold what they had got.
 By this time the Scab was turned to a Leprosie, which
 drew on many other concomitant diseases as its sym-

ptuous: The rest of the Church was some of it infected with some of the foresaid Scab, some more and some less, and some of them still were onely troubled with the old itch, though none perfectly sound nor was that to be expected; much of the Western parts comply with their Leprous Patriarch, and submit to him while he calls himself Universal Bishop and Head of the Catholike Church, some confess some say nothing though they dissent, and indeed the power was got into his hand, so that for fear of persecution few durst contradict, and specially when they saw no likelihood of doing good: Yet some in all Ages even under his nose, did signifie their dissent and offer some help to the cure. At last in *Luther* dayes whole Countries do withdraw from the *Romane* Leprosie (as thousands called *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, &c. had done before them) and so free themselves from the infection, and get off the very scab and make fair attempts for the Cure of the very itch. Now what doth the *Romane* Clergy, but cry out after us as Hereticks and Schismaticks, and ask us [where was our Church before *Luther*?] and who were of our Religion till then? We answer them that if they have the Leprosie, and the times before them had (in most parts) the scab, and the former times the itch, cannot we prove that we are *Albians* well as they, unless we prove that we have the Leprosie, Scab, or Itch as they had? Are these Essential or Integral parts of a man? As humane nature is still with a Leper, but Leprous; and still with him that hath the Scab, but scabbed: so our Religion and Church was at *Rome* and still is; but Leprous since the Usurpation before mentioned: It was before that at *Rome*, but sorely scabbed: It was before that

Rome troubled with the itch : It is still in Greece ,
 Albassia, and other parts, but somewhat scabbed :
 is in millions of the people free from that scab ,
 so in all Ages disliked the Clergies usurpations :
 though we cannot expect to hear this from them in a
 general Council , where they are not to be. But
 we take the people to be a true part of the Church.
 We have separated from you as from Lepers, not
 from the Dead. We bury not your title of a
 Church or Christians , so you will adde [Leprous]
 and a Leprosie proves most commonly a killing dis-
 ease. We have reason to secure our selves from
 your infection, though our love to you were never
 dear.

So that here's the quarrel; and here's our defence.
 All Christs Hospital in the Western part of the
 world, have much increased the disease that he would
 have cured them of; it doth not follow that any man
 that is cured of their Leprosie, ceaseth presently to
 be a man, that he that is reformed of those vices,
 ceaseth to be a member of the Catholike Church :
 or that such Reformed Churches are new things that
 were not before : The Reformation may be new as
 to the latter Ages since corruption prevailed, but
 the Religion or Church-state is not new. Its a sad case
 with the Church when its corruptions are come to be
 accounted of its essence , so that he that will not re-
 maine the corruptions, must not be accounted to be a
 Christian or a Catholike at least, and he that will be
 cured must be accounted to be killed; The Church
 was a Church before it cateht the *Romish* Scab or Le-
 prosie, and therefore is a Church where that is cu-
 red; and I think far better without it, then with

By all this therefore it evidently appeareth that
Papists do most vainly charge us with novelty

How far we account the
Church of Rome a true
Church, and yet the Pa-
pacy no true Church. See
Junius in his exact book *de*
Ecclesia Cast. Bellarm. *oper.*
Fol. 2. m. 1019. And the
judgement of several of our
Divines by Bishop Hall in his
Defence against Burton.

call for a Catalogue
the professors of our Re-
ligion, when the nov-
ty is theirs, and that
selves do yet profess
Religion, though
they have added the
corrupting Leprosy.
Though we cannot
der take to prove that

Church was perfect (nor never will be, till it come
to heaven) yet we have oft proved that it was
Ages without their Popery, and are ready to under-
take the further proof: Of which the next Disputa-
tion shall give you a taste.

There is a Railing Pamphlet extant, called [a
brief confutation of certain absurd, heretical and
damnable doctrines, delivered by Master James Usher
in a Sermon preached before King James at Wansted
Jun. 20. 1624.] The Author calls himself *Pan-
Veridicus*: Its printed at *St Omers*, 1627. Because
take the same way against the Romanists as this
reverend Bishop of *Armagh* taketh, and hath led me
that Sermon, I think my self the more obliged
consider of what is said against it.

The first onset of this *Mr Maledicus*, pag. 9. 10.
is against our assertion that we are of the same Re-
gion, and Church as the *Greeks, Egyptians, Chri-
stians, Ethiopians, &c.* and that all these are not
be damned as Hereticks and unchurched, because the

are not subjects of the Pope. To this 1. He confesseth that even the *Greeks* themselves are not subject to the Pope; and that [they soon departed from the (seeming) union made in the Council of Florence, about the year 1439.] 2. He confesseth that their doctrine about the Procession of the Holy Ghost *a patre per filium* and not *a patre filioque*, was such, that [when they had explicated it they were found to believe very Orthodoxly and Catholicly in the same matter; and for such were admitted.] He affirmeth that [he findeth not that in any substantial point they do dissent from the *Romane Catholicke Church*, excepting the matter of Primacy.]

Let us first observe the consequences of this much. From hence it followeth that the *Greek Churches* are guilty of no Heresie, but non-subjection to the Pope of *Rome*. 2. And that therefore indeed they are no Hereticks. 3. And therefore it is not of necessity to the being of a Church or Catholicke Christian to be subject to the Pope. And that the Pope or *Romane Church* is not to enter the definition of the Catholicke Church: for as the *Greeks* may be Catholics without subjection to *Rome*, so may others. And therefore they are no General Councils where all those Churches are absent, as at *Trent*, *Constance*, &c. And that its a false excuse of *Bellarmin* and the rest, to say that the *Greeks* and the rest are Hereticks or Schismatics. 5. And therefore it declareth to all the world, both that the Popish designe and Religion is carnal and selfish, to exalt themselves above the whole Church of God, and so that they are more then barbarously tyrannical and censorious, and most extreemly schismatical, that will presume to cut off from Christ and

the Church, in the greatest part of the Christian world, even those that themselves confess to be in all other things Orthodoxe, and that meet because they will not be the Popes subjects, now proceed to the next.

The substance of his Answer consisteth of two gross untruths in a publike matter of fact, where many millions of men are able at the first hearing to prove him a bold false witness, making falsehood the prop of his ill cause. The first untruth which he layeth down, is, that the *Grecians* do claim that primacy to their own Patriarke of *Constantinople*, which they deny the Pope: and therefore if it be true it is as bad in them as the Papists, and so they are Protestants. To which I say, it is not true: whatever any private or particular man may say, its well known that its not true of their Church in common, nor found in any of their Church confessions, but utterly and ordinarily disclaimed by them. Though *John of Constantinople* did claim the title of Universal Bishop because of the Emperors residence there, yet did he not get it, which less to be the Universal Governor, and yet much less is it now claimed when the Christian Empire is removed. To be *Episcopus primus* is as much as is desired by the Patriarch himself, which yet he is content to leave, and take the second place, though neither of them concerneth an Universal Episcopacy.

Can they read such books? You may see it in *Nileus* Archbishop of *Thrace*, *Goldastus de Ann.* *salonica* de primatu *Patriarch.* pag. 30. *Tonax* and *Parham*, and many other of the *Greeks*, and yet believe themselves in these fictions? Why do we read, be

hear nothing from the Patriarche of *Constantinople* inviting and perswading us all to submit to his Government, as we and all the Christian world almost have been solicited by the Popes Emissaries to submit ourselves to him? A short Reply may serve to such immodest false assertions as this nicknamed *Verisimile* maketh the chiefeft part of his confutation.

The second untruth which constituteth this part of his answer, is, that [*The Grecians, Moscovites, and Egyptians do in one only point dissent from Rome; and in no point at all agree with the Protestants in quantum such, and dissent from their Catholike Church.*]

This one great falshood containeth two not small ones in it, and each of those two contain abundance more.

1. That all these Churches differ from you in no one point but the Popes supremacy is a falshood beyond all modesty. For besides the supremacy they believe not your pretended Infallibility, nor do they pretend to the like of their own: They believe not your Purgatory; they own not your pardons for easing the pains of Purgatory, nor prayers for the dead to that end; nor the application of the treasury of the Saints Merits to that end, or for satisfaction to the Justice of God. They own not your Transubstantiation: They have the Scripture in their known languages: They worship God in their Liturgies in their known languages, the *Moscovites* in the *Moscovian* tongue, the *Georgians* in the *Iberick*; the *Arabians* in the *Arabick*; and so the *Armenians*, *Slavonians*, *Greeks* in theirs: They administer the Eucharist in both kinds, and detest your Sacrilegious

legious withholding of the cup : They reject your confirmation : so do they your extreme Unction : They admit Priests to live with their wives which were married before ordination : They reject the Religious use of graven Images or Statues : They teach that the holy Scriptures are a sufficient and perfect rule of faith: they believe that they should not be lockt up from the people : They maintain that God is to be worshiped in understanding, and they abhor your praying by Beads and tale : They think not to wash away sin or drive away the devil by holy water : They take not Traditions to be one part of Gods Word, necessary to supply the defects of Scripture; but take them and Church customes and constitutions to be onely for matters of order and determination of such circumstances as it belonged not to the perfection of Gods Laws, to determine, but were to be left to the wisdom of Governors; the Scriptures containing sufficient for salvation : They believe with the Protestants that Justification is not by the Merit of works : And that it is impossible for us properly to Merit *ex condigno* the least mercy, much less the Kingdom of Heaven at the hands of God : They have but one order of Monkes, *viz.* of *St Basil*, and those not such as the Papists; that live a private, unprofitable, drowish life; but their Monasteries are as Colledges to fit them for the service of God in the Church, and thence they oft proceed to be Priests and Prelates : They take your Pope to be condemnable for his pride, cruelty and presumption : his pride for pretending to an universal jurisdiction, and usurping a power to depose Princes and dispose of their Crowns: his cruelty in persecuting other Christians for their differing judgements : and his presumption in grant-

ing pardons and deliverances from Purgatory. In a word they take the Papists for Schismaticks and accordingly condemne them with a solemn condemnation. The *Muscovites* and *Russians* admit not Priests or Deacons to Ordination unless they be married: and they refuse to communicate with the *Romane* Church. The Egyptian Christians allow not of Baptisme in any necessity whatsoever but onely by the Priest and in the Church, and administer the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds: they give not the Lords Supper or extream unction to the sick. They deny Purgatory and prayer for the dead: They marry in the second degree of consanguinity without dispensations: They elevate not the host: They reject all the general Councils after that of *Ephesus*: They repute the Papists to be Hereticks, and avoid their communion no less then of the Jews: Most of these also is common to the *Abassines*, who also admit Marriages of Priests and Bishops, and eat flesh on Fridayes, communicate standing in both kinds.

Are all these nothing? What, no one difference, with this Popish *Veridicus*? I will not desire him to take my word for all this, because I will not take his for the contrary, nor will I turn him to any Protestant for satisfaction, unless he will better use that one which himself citeth (*Sands Relation of the West. Relig. or Europe Specul. p. 234. &c.*) But I may with reason intreat him to believe his own brethren the Papists, and the *Greeks* themselves: And in some of them he may see many more differences then I have here named: For example in their *Possevin. de Robus Moscov.* at large. See also *Concil. Florent. Sess. 18. Jerem. Patri-*

Patriarch. Const. in Resp. 1. ad Germ. Zonar. Annal. Tom. 3. in Imper. Leo. Nilus de Primat. Papæ. Bolam de Primatu Papæ. Sigbert in Chron. ad an. 1054. Leo & Epist. ad Episcop. Constant. Jacob. a Varnico histar. Orient. Sigism. de Rebus Muscov. Guagu. descrip. Moscov. Sacram de Errorib. Rithm. Boleri. Relat. Thom. a Jes. Conuer. Gent. Galich de Rubri. Itiner. Tartar. Oforius de Reb. Emanuel Salignias. Itiner. Alphons. a Castro contr. Heret. Damian a Goet. Præcol. de Hæresib. Alvarez. hist. Ethiop. (which yet have much falsehood) Guid. Surt. de Hæresib. Burchardus. Descrip. terr. Sanct.

If our confuter cannot have leisure to read all these, let him onely read Thom. a Jes. & Rosserius diarch. Moscov. & Apparut. Sacra. and see to his shame what his own friends say against his falsehoods.

And that all these Christians are as considerable as all the Papists in the world, far over matching them for number, is apparent: Much more when we adde to the Grecians and Moscovites, and Copes's, all the Syrians, the Georgians, the Indians of Saint Thomas the Abassinæ, the Nestorians, the Jacobites, the Armenians, and the Maronites, and to them as Protestants, where then is the Papists Univerſality, and how few are they comparatively, and how plainly do they play the Donatists (but that it is on a far worse ground)

The Patriarch of Constantinople alone hath under him in Asia (as Brierwood noteth) the Christians of Natolia (excepting Armenia the less and Cilicia) of Circassia, of Mengrelia, and of Russia: And in Europe also the Christians of Greece, Macedon, Epirus, Thrace,

Thrace, Bulgaria, Rascia, Sextia, Bosnia, Walachia, Moldavia, Podolia, and Muscovia (till lately) together with all the Islands of the *Aegean Sea*, and others about *Greece*, as far as *Corfu*, with much more.

And as is noted in *Curopolat. de Offic. Rulaf. Constant. & Offic. Mag. Eccl.* he hath under him, The Archbishop of *Cesarea in Cappadocia*; 2. *Ephesus*, 3. *Heraclea*, 4. *Ancyra*, 5. *Euxinum*, 6. *Sardis*, 7. *Nicomedia*, 8. *Nice*, 9. *Calcedon*, 10. *Mitylene*, 11. *Thessalonica*, 12. *Laodicea*, 13. *Synada*, 14. *Iconium*, 15. *Corinth*, 16. *Athens*, 17. *Patra*, 18. *Trapezuntium*, 19. *Larissa*, 20. *Naupactum*, 21. *Adrianapolis*. These are all Archbishops, and have many Bishops under them, viz. Of *Muscovy* 17. of *Larissa* 13. of *Athens* 11. of *Corinth* 10. of *Thessalonica* 9. &c.

And if these be under the Patriarch of *Constantinople* alone, how great a number are all the rest in the great Empire of the *Abissines*, and elsewhere through the rest of the Christian world?

I do not mention all these to intimate either that multitudes prove them or any to have the best cause, if we were in all things of their mindes; or as if I preferred them for Arts and Civil Policy to the *Romanes*, but to show both the baniousness of the Popish Schisme that would unchurch so many; and the cruelty of their censures that would damne so many; and the Impudency of their pretence of Universality, and their vaine boasting of [All the Church] when they are so small a part of the Church, and more bad then small.

But we have been too long on this: let us come to the

the confuters next untruth; and that is [That the Grecians, &c. do in no one point agree with Protestants as such] what hath been said doth sufficiently shame that fiction.

But he instanceth in our differences: And he saith [The Grecians hold one supreme head of the whole Church under Christ] Repl. An immodest fiction on to uphold a cause thats like it.

2. He saith [The Grecians hold the Real presence of our Saviours body and blood in the Eucharist] Repl. not Transubstantiation; which they deny: The But Protestants do hold some kind of Reall presence.

3. He saith [The Grecians defend the necessity of Baptisme to salvation; and that Original sin is remitted thereby] Repl. And the Protestants hold it necessary *necessitate precepti*, and as an ordinary mean where it can be had: And neither the Greeks nor all your own dare damne all Infants that dye before Baptisme; when it could not be had; but you say that the *Vatum* may serve turne. And also Protestants hold that if the Infants be within the Covenant, as it pardoneth their Original sin primarily, so Baptisme pardoneth it by way of oblation and solemne conveyance: But what is all this to your error that Original sin is not onely remitted, but quite extinct or done away out of our natures by Baptisme; so that the new baptized Infant, is perfectly without any Radical sin, as well as without the Guilt of it?

4. He saith [They say that works do justify with faith: You not] Repl. They say that we are not justified by the Merit of Works, but by the alone Merit of Christ; and so do we. We deny not in every sense:

sence that [we are Justified by Works, and not by faith onely] for in *James* his sence we maintain it; else we should deny the Scripture: The question is not therefore absolutely, whether we are Justified by Works? but, In what sence we are, and in what not? We say that Christ is the onely Satisfier of Gods Justice and Meriter of Righteousness; and that Faith is the onely Receiving Condition; and that the Works of the Law that *Paul* excludeth have no hand in it; and that the Works of Grace which *James* takes in, are but conditions without which our Justification (begun without them) shall not be continued, and of our finall Absolution or Justification in Judgement; and so are but a Particular, and not an Universall or Legall Righteousnesse. (Of which I have given a full account in my Confession.)

5. He saith [*They maintain Freewill, even in the best actions. You not*] Repl. Freewill is either 1. Natural; which is but its self-determining power, with spontaneity; and this we deny not (For who denyeth man to be man, and to have the *Facultatem Volendi*?) Or it is, 2. Moral, and that is 1. Political, when a Governor gives the subject leave to do a thing; and so we maintain that God giveth our Wills Freedom to all good, and to no evil: Or 2. Ethical, which is nothing but the right inclination and Habits of the will with the absence of the contrary Habits: And so we say that, the better men are, the Freer, that is, the better are their Wills: And the unconverted have not this Freewill: nor the converted in perfection till they come to Glory: For the Freedom

dom is the Goodness. And seeing the Will so far Free Ethically as it is Good, Vertuous or Holy, the Question then is, Whether every mans Will be Good and Holy? which I am conceited you will not dare to affirme. A covetous man, a drunkard, an ungodly man, is as much or more denominated such from the habite as from the act: he is most vicious that is Habitually so: To say therefore that such mans Will is Free in this Ethical sence is to say that he is habitually no covetous man, no drunkard, no ungodly man no sinner: which being contrary to unquestionable experience, me thinks should be easily deserted. If you know of any thing else called Freewill besides these three before mentioned, we should be glad to know it too. The natural Essential Freedom, viz. A spontaneous self-determining power, we all confesse: The Political Freedom, yea and obligation none denyeth: The Ethical Freedom, that is, Vertuous or holy Inclinations in wicked men, you will deny your selves; where then is the difference between us and either the *Greeks* or you.

Why you'l say, perhaps, that its here, That we deny the will to have that *Indifferency* which you affirme, as to opposite objects. But we are loath to fight with you in the Dark. Do you mean by *Indifferency* an Indifferency of Natural Power, or an indifferency of inclination or Habite? The first we do not deny: The will is a natural faculty that hath naturally no determination to One, where many means are propounded, but is undetermined, and hath a natural Power to determine it self to either: But yet you know the Wills Natural Power is exercised according to inclining Objects and Habits: And
you

You cannot expect that men who are Habitually inclined earthwards, should Will Heavenly things and renounce earthly things, meerly because they have a natural Power of choosing : for they want that inclination, which is called commonly the Moral Power : And I should suppose that in regard of this Moral Power, you will not affirm your selves that he hath *indifferentiam ad oppositum*? To say that a mans Will is indifferently inclined to Good and to Evil, is to say that the man is habitually neither good nor bad, unless as privation of due inclinations denominate him bad. I say the more of this, Dr. J. R. because I finde others of your party, and some that seem to disown both you and us (as a late Treatise of Repentance among others can witness) to harp so much on this string, and confusedly talke of Freewill before they tell us what they mean, and to perswade the world that we teach that God hath laid such a natural necessity on man to sin as he hath to eat and drink and sleep, and that God might as well damne men for being hungry or sleepy, as for being sinful in our sence! As if there were no more faultiness in a vicious disposition of the Will it selfe, then in a necessary natural inclination or Appetite of those faculties which were never made to rule themselves, but to be moderated by the Will of Reason. It may be these men will either deny the truth of the words of the Holy Ghost, that *They that are accustomed to do evil cannot learn to do well no more then a Leopard can change his spots, or a Blackamore his skin*; or else they will think such men excusable because they are so strongly enclined to evil; and so if a man habituated to Lust shall viciate their wives, or a man habituated to malice shall beat them often, or maim them, or kill their

their friends, they may think that he deserveth punishment but pity, because he is so bad that he could not (morally, that is, he would not) do it.

But they say, we teach that mens Wills have a necessity of sinning imposed on them. But we have learnt that Habites do not determine the Will naturally, nor alway infallibly, but leave it free to a natural self-determination: But yet we know that ordinarily determineth it self according to predominant habits. And there must be somewhat extraordinary to procure the Will to determine it self to good where it is habitually inclined to evil. So much may serve to vindicate our Doctrine about Freewill. And as for the cause of its captivity, it belongs not to this subject to speak of it, but to that of Original sin (where the said Doctor so notably plays his part) to which we shall not now digress.

The next instance of the Papist is this [*They (i.e. the Greeks maintain) seven Sacraments, you not.* Repl. 1. This is another very immodest untruth: I wonder that men dare venture their souls upon a Religion that must be thus upheld by falsehoods. Your own Writers before alledged, witness that the Greeks deny the very use of confirmation and extreme Unction: and how then can they account them Sacraments! Nor do they take Marriage for a proper Sacrament. 2. We cannot dispute this point with you upon the bare name; Give us the definition of a Sacrament, and we shall give you our Reply. And a Sacrament signifieth any Christian mystery, or mysterious Ordinance signifying some spiritual thing, we doubt not but there are more then seven Sacraments, but not as it signifieth, an instituted signe, to

al the Covenant of Grace, and exhibit its great
enefits. *Calvin* hath yielded to you, that in a
rger sence Ordination is a Sacrament.

He next addeth [*They say that Christ dyed for all
ankind; You say not, but onely for the Elect.*] Repl.
ill more confusion, do not your own Schoolmen
nd other Divines say that he dyed, for All men suf-
ciently, and for the Elect onely effectually? And
do we! where then is the difference? Not so much
a this point as in another conjunct: You say that
s mans Free-will, that is the chief differencing
ause, in making Christs death effectual for the sal-
ation of the Elect; and we deny it, and say that
is Gods special Grace. 2. Do not you know that
bout this and the former point of Freewill, you
iffer as much among your selves, and that we say
o more then your Dominicans do (no nor so much
n the point of predetermination.) 3. Do you not
now that half the Protestants (those whom you
all *Lutherans*) do hold universal Redemption as
well as you? Be it right or wrong therefore you
ould not impute the contrary to all.

We say that it was the sins of all mankind and
not onely of the Elect that lay upon Christ in his
uffering: and that God as Legislator of the old vi-
olated Law hath received a sufficient satisfaction for
all, and that hereupon a conditional Pardon is grant-
ed to all by a Law of Grace, and that the condition
s but their Acceptance of what is freely offered (ac-
ording to its nature and use) and that all and onely
they that perform this condition shall have Actual
pardon and salvation. But then we do not say, that
Christ did equally intend the procurement of the per-
formance of this condition: but that he giveth some

an inseparable special Grace which shall infallibly procure it, which he doth not to others, who have so much as shall leave them in their own consciences and at his bar without any just excuse. I pray you shew us next what the *Greeks* say more then this. In particular that Reverend man against whom you write hath an excellent *M. S.* abroad for Universal Redemption.

The next feigned difference between us and the *Greeke* is this [*They confess that God hath given sufficient Grace to every one to be saved: You say but only to the Elect*] Repl. You again wrong them shew us where they say so if you can. You own the Doctrine your selves it seems; and thereby discover your enmity to Grace; Do you think that every childe, ignorant sot, or wicked person hath Grace sufficient to salvation? If he have sufficient either he needs no more, or he may be saved without more. And then it seems converting Grace is needless to an Infidel, for he hath enough already: then it seems, you will be beholden to God for more Grace after the first hour of your conversion, nay after the first hour of your life or use of reason, to your death. For if you had sufficient for salvation the first hour, then what need you any more: you will it seems pray God to keep it to himself, for you have enough already. I will tell you what the *Greeks* and we, and some of your selves hold, that is, that every man hath so much Grace (that is, Helpe and Mercy contrary to Merit) as is in his own kind sufficient to make him better then he is, and to bring him neerer to Christ or salvation, and which his owne will is obliged to make effectual by right entertainment and improvement, and might

: But we do not say that all men have sufficient Grace to believe to justification, or sufficient to salvation; nay we say that no Believer hath sufficient Grace to salvation, till the soul pass from the body: for still he hath need of preserving Grace to the last breath. Men that are at a great distance from Christ may have sufficient Grace to come neer to him; and justly perish if they refuse or abuse such Grace, though they never had Grace sufficient to believe; because it is their own fault that they had it not.

The next pretended difference, is [*They pray and offer Sacrifice for the dead: You not*] Repl. I will see your proof of this too, before I will believe you. We know they do it not in the Popish sence, that for delivering souls out of the fire of Purgatory, because they deny such a state. If you will read this Reverend Bishop whom you oppose in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, on that point, you will see the difference between the Ancients (and so the Greeks) praying for the dead and yours.

He addeth [*They invoke Saints and Angels; you not*] Repl. Of this also see Bishop *Usher* in the fore-mentioned place. We take this for their error: and we do not take our selves to be of a different Church or Religion from every one that erreth.

He next addeth [*They worship the Cross and Images: you not*] Repl. But they do it not as many of ours, with Divine worship. Their worship is but reverence for the Relation sake; and they will not so much as use any Statues or Graven Images as you do. And do not those you call *Lutherans*, do as they in this (though how rightly I say not?)

He addes [*They honor reliques : you not*] *Rep.* We honor them as far as they have any true Relation to any honorable person. But we will not therefore carry them about us to keep away the Devil, or forge a multitude of lies about the cures which they miraculously perform : Nor do the *Greeks* so far as I know or hear.

The next is [*They maintain Traditions : you not*] *Repl.* They renounce your Traditions which are pretended to be part of Gods Word, supplying the defects of Scripture which is but the other half : For they maintain the sufficiency of Scripture to salvation. And some Traditions both they and we maintain. As the Tradition of the Scriptures themselves down to our hands ; the Tradition of the Sum of Christianity in the Creed and Baptism, &c. Of which see what I have said elsewhere, in the Preface to the second part of the *Saints Rest Edit. 2. &c.* And in the determination in a book called, *The unreasonableness of Infidelity* : And see what the Bishop, whom you oppose hath said against the Jesuite on Tradition.

The next is [*They Auricular confession : you not*] *Rep.* 1. The Christians that deny your communion are divided in this : These called Nestorians and many more deny Auricular Confession : and others maintain it. 2. We deny not our selves, but that it is the duty of Christians when sin lyeth on their consciences, when they have fallen into it, and know not the way out again to have recourse to their faithful judicious Guides for advice herein for the safety of their souls and so far to confess as is necessary to such advice and safety. But we do not believe that we are bound to tell the Priest of every sin, no nor of every heinous sin : for in some cases we may have a fitter course

will not go to a Pyhſician for every prick of a pin ;
 cut finger, which many neighbors or my ſelf can
 are as well as he : I will not ſo far needleſſy trouble
 m : Nor will I go to a bad unfaithful Phyſician ,
 when I can have a better ; nor yet to an ignorant
 an, becauſe he hath got the degree of a Doctor of
 phyſicke, when I may go to an able man that pro-
 ſeſſeth not Phyſick. You know the Applicati-
 on.

Its next ſaid [*They Enangelical counſels and works*
[supererrogation : You not] Rep. We acknowledge
 that there are many very good works. 1. Which
 are the duty of ſome few Chriſtians upon ſome ſpeci-
 al occaſions, and not of all or moſt. 2. Which are ſo
 the duty of thoſe few, as that yet many of them are
 ſaved that perform them not ; being not made of the
 ſame neceſſity to ſalvation as ſome other duties are.
 And we ſee not how any man can reaſonably imagine,
 that there is any work more excellent than others ,
 which yet is not a duty ; when God hath command-
 ed us to love him with all our heart, and might, and
 ſtrength ; and to imploy all talents to the utmoſt for
 his Glory : and that any Duty can be neglected
 without ſin, is as abſurd. How the *Greeks* and we
 differ in this, we ſhall better know when you ſhew
 and prove it to us.

He next adds [*They the Merit of good Works :*
You not] We acknowledge, that Good Works are
 pleaſing to God through Chriſt, and rewardable ;
 and they ſay in ſence no more : We thinke not
 meet to quarrel about the meer name. They re-
 nounce and abhorre the Popiſh Merit of con-
 dignity *ex proportione operis* ; as is before
 ſaid.

In the next place the confuter alledgeth his proof of all these differences from us, and consent with them. The first proof is out of *Aët. Theolog. Wittenberg. in Crispin. de statu Eccles.* in these words [*The Greek and Romane Church are divided onely in the controversie of Primacy, and variety of Ceremony*] *Rep.* I have not *Crispinus* now by me, and therefore can make no other answer but this, that if he be truly alledged, yet 1. Abundance of great differences (as about Sacraments, Orders, Traditions, &c.) may be comprised in that of Ceremony. 2. Else your own Writers will tell you that this is a mistake.

His second proof is from *Sir Edwin Sands Europ. Specul.* To which I say 1. How unworthily did you conceal the multitude of differences mentioned in the same Author in the same place between you and the *Greeks*, and say there was but one? 2. By *Purgatory Sands* tells you after he means not your Purgatory: And its known the *Greeks* deny it: Though they think that the Saints have some less degree of glory distant from the face of God before the resurrection. 3. About Transubstantiation and the Mass *Sands* is mistaken. The *Greeks* hold a kind of Real presence, but not Transubstantiation: And the Mass of the Papists doth abundantly differ from them (as in the denial of Transubstantiation, elevation, &c. may appear, and is at large by many of ours expressed, which may save me the labor of a recital.)

Next the ignorant Priest would by a Syllogisme prove the Bishop a Papist, and in the making of his Syllogisme he is out before he could reach the conclusion, and begins again, and yet would not blot out his former error, so wary is he that he lose not a

ne of his own writing. The mended Syllogisme is
 his [*Those who embrace the Communion of the Greci-
 an Church notwithstanding the error of Supremacy,
 cannot in reason refuse the Communion of the Romane
 for the same: But Mr. Ushers Church embraceth the
 Communion of the Greek Church notwithstanding that
 Error: Therefore, &c.*] Repl. 1. To the Major it is
 falsely supposed that we refuse your Communion for
 that Error alone: It is for that with abundance more.
 2. To the Minor, I answer by denying it: and say
 you shamelessly slander the Greek Church: They main-
 tain not any Power of Governing the whole Church
 as the head of it, and Christs Vicar general, nor any
 infallibility, &c. as you do.

Next he will prove that Mr. Ushers Church can
 have no Union or Communion with the Greek
 Church at all: and that by this Syllogisme [*That
 Church which is a member of another Church, that
 other Church must also be a member of it: But the
 Greek Church is no member of Mr. Ushers Church;
 therefore Mr. Ushers is no member of the Greek
 Church.*] The Minor he proveth from *Jeremias Pa-
 triarch of Constantinople and Respons. Basil. Ducis
 Moscov. Rep. 1.* The part is not a part of another
 part, a member is not a member of another co-ordi-
 nate member; but of the whole. 2. I say, the
 proofs of your Minor are vain. It is not two mens
 sayings that can make the Greek Church and the Pro-
 testants so dis-joyned as not to be members of the
 Universal Church. If *Italy* tell *France*, and *France*
 again tell *Italy* that they are no part of *Europe*, it
 is not therefore true. If *Canterbury* tell *York* that
 they are not a part of *England*, it is not therefore
 true. Every childe is not a Bastard that is so called

by an angry brother: If Patriarch *Jeremiah* hit you
turn (which I know not, for I have not seen him)
why may not we as well plead the consent of Patriarch
Cyrill; whose Protestant confession you may see in *Alstedius's Enclucopadia*, and elsewhere?

Next he comes to the *Abassines*, where (after the mention of their circumcision) he as falsely affirmeth, that [*In all other things they profess the faith of the Catholike Church acknowledging the Pope the supreme head thereof, and Christs Vicar upon earth*] which he proves by a confession exhibited to *Gregory* the 13. and recorded by *Posseline. Rep.* This is to make the foundation like the superstructure, and defend falshood with falshood: If you were so ignorant your selves as not to know the *Romane* juggling about that confession, you could not imagine the learned Bishop so ignorant. Not onely your own *Godigen de rebus Abassinorum*, may tell you, but the generality of your faction may sure inform you by this time, that all your cunning industry cannot get the *Abassines* under your Papal Yoak. And if you should prevail for the time to come, that's nothing to the time past. The *Abassines* (to let pass their errors wherein they differ from you and us) do communicate in both kinds, they believe the souls of Infants departing unbaptized to be saved because they spring from faithful parents: They reject Statues & massy Images: They elevate not the Sacrament, nor reserve it after Communion: Their Priests labor, but beg not: The Emperor conferreth Bishopricks and Benefices: They use no confirmation nor extreame unction: They admit a first marriage in Bishops and Priests: They eat flesh on Fridays. And

yet this man saith they differ not from them.

The second Chapter is the meer ebullition of foolish malice, deserving no reply to those that do not desire to be deceived. He would prove, that according to these lax principles of our charity, we may agree with Jews, Turkes, Mahometans! As if we needed a dispute to prove that these are no Christians, and that the *Greeks, Abassines, &c.* are: But such disputes do the Papists put us upon.

The Bishop had concluded in his Sermon, that [If we should survey the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, and put by the points wherein they differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the Articles wherein all generally agree, we should finde so much truth in them, as being joyned with holy obedience may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting salvation; neither have we cause to doubt but as many as do walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded by superinducing any damnable heresies thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith, with a leud and wicked conversation, Peace shall be upon them and Mercy and upon the Israel of God.]

And what hath the Confuter to say against this? Why first he begins with the Sacraments, to try whether those commonly agreed on may save. And here he first tells us, that [Some Churches are for seven, some for three, and some for two, and no more: therefore here is no agreement] Rep. 1. Let the nominal differences about the word Sacrament be first laid by (unless you think that word necessary to salvation) and then we shall the better see what real difference remaineth. 2. The two Sacraments then are confessed by

by all, and the use of the rest which you call Sacraments: This much (in its own place) then may save, where no more is confessed. 3. You vainly put in the *exclusion of more*, for thats none of the things that all agree on: All agree that there are two Sacraments: and those may save. But all agree not that there is but two. This man therefore seems to dote; when he should gather up the common agreements according to the Bishops proposal, he gathereth up the disagreements, or vainly pretendeth that we agree in nothing. What, do not you confess that Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Sacraments? and do not we do so too?

Next he comes to the use of Baptisme, and saith that [*The Romanes and Greeks, say, that there is no other use of baptisme but to wash away sin: The Protestants of England and Geneva say, that it is no laver of Regeneration at all, but only a seal of Gods promise made to the party baptized: and that the childe unbaptized may be saved and the baptized damned.*] Repl. 1. You make your selves (much more the *Greeks*) worse then you are. Do not your own maintain that Baptism admitteth into the Church and granteth many other priviledges, besides washing away sin. 2. We say, that to the children of promise it doth secondarily and by obfignation wash away (or pardon) sin by way of obfignation and solemne exhibition, as the promise doth primarily as a deed of gift or legal Grant: as also that in the same way it secondarily conveyeth further Grace according to the capacity of the subject, and admitteth into the Church. And all this is commonly confessed by your selves and all Christians of the *Greek or Abissine Churches, &c.* This much alone without your addi-

additions is as much (at least) as is necessary to salvation, to be believed concerning baptism.

Next he cometh to the Lords Supper, and saith, that one party holdeth the real presence and the other not? And what of this? Doth that prove the insufficiency of what all are agreed on? what we hold, you deny not: We hold the signifying, and sealing and exhibiting use of the Sacrament (though we deny Transubstantiation) And dare you deny these? We hold that it is the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christs body and blood offered once on the Crofs for the sins of the world: and that it is a means of Church-communion: And dare you deny these? Lay by your Additions, and that which we are all agreed in is enough to salvation.

His next instance is about Faith; Because we say, that Historical faith may be in Devils, and Miraculous faith in the wicked, and *Calvin* defineth justifying faith to be a firme and certain knowledge of the love of God to us, &c. and the *Lutherans*, that it is an undoubted perswasion of the pardon of our sins and adoption, &c. and this faith is by the Council of *Trent* condemned to the pit of hell, therefore he concludeth that there is no saving faith common to Papists and Protestants.

Repl. Here again you vainly and fallaciously bring in the disagreements, and over pass the agreements.

1. We are agreed that all those which the Protestants call the Canonical books of Scripture are the word of God: and true, and particularly all the Articles of the Creed, and many things more: We are agreed that Christ and life is offered by the Universal promise in the Gospel to all that hear it: and that all must first believe the truth of this promise and then heartily

heartily consent to the offer and accept the benefit, and also believe and fear the threatening, and joyne sincere love and obedience to all this. This we are all agreed in: And this is certainly saving to all that sincerely believe and do as they thus profess. But then, whether Historical faith be common or not? whether assurance or strong perswasion of pardon, be faith, or justifying faith, with other the like, these we are not agreed in; and without these we may be saved.

The next exception is only this, The Bishop tells us not what be those Heresies that destroy this common faith. *Rep.* And doth that cross his former charitable conclusion? What? because he undertakes not an alien task? Why in general, they are any thing that is so held as that the common Articles of faith cannot be held with it, and that practically.

The sum of the next passage, is this [*That it is absurd for us to call them the true Church, or say they may be saved, when we have charged them with so much error and idolatry, &c*] *Repi.* 1. We onely say that you are a polluted part of the Church. 2. If your salvation be made so difficult by your errors look you to that: The Bishops conclusion (of the sufficiency of the *communiter credita*) is nevertheless sound, though you destroy your selves by your corrupt additions. 3. Multitudes among you believe not your Infallibility, Transubstantiation, and many the like errors. 4. Many that behold them as opinions speculatively, may yet hold the contrary truths practically, not discerning the contradiction.

I would gladly have shewed the vainty of the rest of that Pamphlet, because I see he hath contracted
most

most of their common cavils into a narrow room ;
 but the rest is less to our present purpose, and the
 same things are already answered by many ; and
 therefore I shall no further Digress in the pursuit of
 this Confuter, having already said so much against
 the chief of their objections, as may leave the im-
 partial Reader confirmed in it, *That notwithstand-*
ing the Popish cavils to the contrary, it is apparent,
that the Christian Catholike Reformed Religion com-
monly called Protestant is a safe way to Salvation.



Qu-



QUERY.

*Whether Popery be a safe way to
Salvation? Neg.*

IT is not as other mens Judges that we determine this Question; to their own master do they stand or fall: but it is to render an account of our own Belief and practice, and for our further confirmation in the truth for the defence of it against gain-sayers, and for the establishing of our people against the sophistry and seduction of Deceivers.

For the explication of the terms, I shall tell you
1. What I mean by *Popery*. 2. What I mean by *Salvation*. 3. What by *the way* to it. 4. What by *the word Safe*.

1. *Popery* is a certain sarrago, a mixture of many grievous errors in the doctrine of Faith, Government and Worship, expressed in their Authorized writings,

ings, especially in their decretals and Councils, corrupting the Christian Religion which they profess; the whole being denominated from that one falsehood, that the Pope of *Rome* is, the Universall Bishop, and Visible Head of the Universal Church and Christs Vicar-General on earth, and that only is the Catholike Church, and those only Catholiks that so believe.

Where note 1. That the Papists professing to be Christians, do first own the substance of Christian doctrine, and then corrupt it, and contradict it by this fardle of their own inventions superadded. They profess to believe the holy Scriptures to be the word of God, and to be true: every Book that we believe (and more) They profess to believe all the Articles of the ancient Creeds commonly called the Apostles, the *Nicene*, or *Constantinopolitane*. It is not the Christianity or true doctrine which they profess, which we call *Popery*. 2. It is therefore onely their own invented corruptions, by which they contradict the Christian verity which they profess, which we call *Popery*. 3. Note, That the common denominating corruption, is the forementioned doctrine of the Popes Universal Episcopacy and Headship, or a supremacy at least, if not Infallibility: and that the Catholike Church, and the *Romane* Church is all one: and the Pope is the visible center of its Unity. 4. Note also that as to the rest of their corruptions, they agree not among themselves what is to be esteemed of their faith or Religion, and what not: and therefore it cannot be expected that we should give you an exact enumeration of the points of their faith, and so a compleat description of *Popery*, which is such a self-contradicting unreconcilable

able hodge podge. But their errors may be distributed into these three ranks. 1. Those that are established by the Pope and his (supposed) general Council: These they all receive and own. 2. Those that are established by the Popes Decretals without a Council. These some own as points of their faith, and some reject them. I will not adde as the third, those that are established by a Council without the Pope; not because there never was a Council that dissented from him in Good, but because it is a difficult matter at least to find any Council that did go beyond or without him in Evil, or erred without his Approbation. 3. The third sort therefore shall be those opinions that are commonly maintained by their most Approved Writers which are published in books that are licensed and commended by the Popes Authorized agents, but are not determined by the Pope or his Council. These though they contend for, and lay great weight on them in their disputations, yet dare they not own them as any part of the matter of their faith, lest they seem to be what they are; divided and mutable. A man would think that those voluminous hot disputes about Divine things, did intimate that the Authors did *fide divina* believe those points which they do so zealously dispute of. But if it be their pleasure, that we should so distinguish, we will call the rest the *Popish faith or Religion*, and these last, the *Popish opinions*, because we would fasten on them nothing but their own.

If you ask me, which be those doctrines which they take for points of faith, which we call Popery; I must refer you to their Decretals and Councils on one side, and Gods word on the other; and all the doctrines

Doctrines in those their Canons or determinations
that are against the word of God, are the doctrines
which we mean by this name. If they do lay greater
stress upon any one point than others, its likely to
be on those that are put into their Creeds and Vows,
and therefore I shall onely recite the latter half of
their *Tridentine Creed*, seeing they will own that
for nothing. When they have begun with the ancient
Constantinopolitan Creed, containing the true Prin-
ciples of Christian Religion, and have ended that
they proceed thus as followeth:

The Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions; and
the rest of the Observations and constitutions of the
same Church, I do most firmly admit and embrace.
I admit also the sacred Scripture according to that
sense which the Holy Mother the Church hath held
and doth hold, to whom it belongeth to judge of the
true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures:
and I will never take and interpret it, but according
to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. I do profess
also that there are seven truly and properly Sacra-
ments of the new Law instituted by Jesus Christ our
Lord, and necessary to the salvation of mankind,
though not all to every one; to wit, Baptisme, Confir-
mation, the Eucharist, Penance, extreme Uncti-
on, Order, and Matrimony: and that they confer
grace; and that of these, Baptisme, Confirmation,
and Order, cannot be reiterated without Sacrilege.
I do also receive and admit the received and approved
Rites of the Catholike Church in the solemn Admini-
stration of all the aforesaid Sacraments. I do embrace
and receive all and singular things which in the Holy
Council of Trent were defined and declared about Ori-
ginal sin and Justification. In like manner I do pro-

fess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true pro-
 per, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living, and for
 the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the
 Eucharist there is Truly, Really, and Substantially
 the body and blood, together with the soul and Divi-
 nity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a
 change made of the whole substance of Bread into
 the Body, and of the whole substance of Wine into
 blood; which change the Catholike Church call-
 eth Transubstantiation. I confess also that under one
 only, whole and entire Christ, and the true Sacra-
 ment is taken. I do constantly hold that there is a Pa-
 gatory; and that the souls there detained are helped by
 the suffrages of the faithful. As also that the Saints
 reigning with Christ, are to be revered and ad-
 led upon, and that they do offer prayers to God for us,
 and their reliques are to be revered (or honoured). I
 do most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, and
 the Mother of God ever a Virgin, as also of other Saints
 are to be had and kept, and that due honor and Vene-
 ration is to be given them. I affirm also that the power
 of Indulgences is left by Christ in the Church, and
 that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian peo-
 ple. I acknowledge that the holy Catholike and Apo-
 stolike Church of Rome, is the Mother and Mistress of
 all Churches: And I do promise and swear true Obe-
 dience to the Pope of Rome successor of Blessed Peter
 Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.
 Also all other things delivered, defined and declared
 by the sacred Canons, and Oecumenical Councils, and
 especially of the holy Synod of Trent, I do without
 doubting receive and profess: and also all things con-
 trary, and all heresies whatsoever condemned by the
 Church, and rejected; and Anathematized, do I re-
 use.

the manner condemn, reject and Anathematize. This true Catholike faith, without which no man can be saved, which at the present I do voluntarily professe, and truly hold, the same will I take care to hold and confess entire and inviolate, by Gods help, most constantly, even to the last breath of my life; and as much as in me lyeth, to be hold, taught, and preached, by those that are under me, or those whose care belongs to me in my office. This I. N. do Promise, Vow, and swear, so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.

So far the Trent Confession, which I the rather recite that you may see what their Religion is in their own words and oaths; where you see also that this is but a small part of it; for it is moreover so large, as all the Council of Trent, and all other Ecumenical Councils and holy Canons; of the Impossibilities and self-contradictions of which faith, we shall say more anon.

So that I conclude that it is not Christianity, but this additional Leprosie which we call by the name of Popery: they believe this much more then we (or a great part more) and by believing more, they believe less, while they destroy the sound faith which they before seemed to profess.

2. For the next term to be explained [*Salvation*] we mean by it principally, *Everlasting Glory*; and shall those beginnings of it inclusively which we have in this life, consisting in our Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, Consolation, and Perseverance.

3. By the term [*Way*] we mean, such necessary means as are prescribed us by God for the attainment of Salvation, either as to our Belief, or our Affecti-

on and Practice according to the directions of the doctrine which we do believe.

4. As to the sense of the word [*Safe*] it signifieth that which is free from danger, or which tendeth to a mans welfare. Now here is a double safety considerable in Doctrines answerable to a double danger. First, its one thing to be safe from any sin in the way to Salvation; and so we may well say that Popery is no safe way which leadeth to so much sin. But thats not all that is here intended: But its another matter to be so deep in sin, as not to be safe from the Everlasting Punishment, but that Salvation it self is endangered thereby: and this we principally intend. And whereas there are several Degrees of Danger, we mean that true Popery heartily entertained and practiced, doth leave but small probability, if any possibility, of the Salvation of any that do persevere impenitently therein to the end.

Though you may see what I deny in what is already said, yet for the greater perspicuity, I shall express my sense in these few Propositions following.

Prop. 1. That Christian doctrine contained in the holy Scriptures which the Papists do profess to believe, is of it self without their corruptions, a safe way to salvation.

Prop. 2. Whatever errors are held by Papists or any others, which do consist with a true practical belief of the foresaid Christian doctrine which they confess, and we are agreed in, those errors shall not exclude the erroneous from Salvation.

Prop. 3. The Papists do not expressly in terms and sense deny any fundamental point of faith.

Prop.

Prop. 4. Its possible even practically to hold an error, which by remote consequence contradicth a fundamental Truth, and yet to hold that truth practically, and so to be saved. For either all moral errors in Theology (as *Ameſius* thought) do contradict the Foundation by consequence, by reason of the necessary concatenation of Truthes; or most at least.

Prop. 5. There are some errors so great that if they were cordially and practically held, would be inconsistent with the cordial practical holding of the Foundation; which yet may be held but speculatively and notionally in consistency with the cordial and practical belief of the fundamentals; and the person not knowing the contradiction may be saved.

Prop. 6. Multitudes of people while they take common termes in Divinity in a wrong sence, do maintain Propositions which by plain consequence, if not directly contradict the Fundamentals according to the proper genuine sence of the words; when yet in the sence as they mistake and misuse them in, there is no contradiction. Even as many on the other side, do hold the Christian verity in words, who in sence deny it.

Prop. 7. We have great reason to think that many millions of the Laity among the Papists, if not the far greatest part of them, do not cordially embrace the most of the Popish corruptions in doctrinals, nor the most dangerous of them.

1. Because they do not understand them, and so cannot so much as speculatively receive them. It is not one of a hundred, perhaps of many hundreds among them, that knows all contained in the Council of Trent alone, much less in all the rest of the

Council, and Canons and customes wherein they place their Religion. Nay perhaps its but few of their Clergy that know this comparatively. So that it is but an implicate general belief that they can give to such Canons as are unknown, which is not a belief of the particular doctrines contained in them, as such.

2. Because (I hope among most or many of them) they are first taught the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and ten Commandments (or at least the Creed, and Decalogue, though the Lords Prayer be usually taught them in Latine) which contain the Fundamentals of Christian faith and practice: and therefore we have reason to hope that these are deeper in their minds than any contradictory doctrines: especially when they must have so much time afterward, to build upon this foundation their hay and stubbles, that we have great reason to hope that it is but few that throughly understand or entertain them.

3. Because we know that the generality of the people, or a very great part of them, do look upon their Clergy as having a carnal self-interest to carry on, and so far have hard and different thoughts of them; though they are yet captivated by them too much.

4. Because we see that the Pope is faine to keep them in subjection by the most cruel force of secular power: by the bloody inquisition, tormenting and burning them; or raising wars against them to ruine them; or else by worldly honors, dignities, and riches to entice and ensnare them; which were needless if he could carry it by the cogent evidence of his doctrines or their understandings.

5. Because we see by experience, that even here with us among their few most zealous and voluntary Profelites, it is but very few that call themselves *Romane* Catholikes, or Papists, that indeed know what Popery is: Nay most of them, if you do but name some points of the Popish faith, will tell you, that you slander them; and they hold no such thing. I have talked with many of the Laity, and find very few that will own the doctrine of mans Merits, but profess to rest on the Merits of Christ onely: The like I could say of other points: By which it is plain that the Priests do hide from the Laity so much of the venome of their doctrine as they think will prove distastful to them, and dare not let them know the worst.

Prop. 8. These persons before described, together with that part of the Clergy, who cast off much of the *Romane* corruptions, and yet adhere to their party, are not *full and compleat Papists*, but onely Papists *secundum quid*, incompleat, and of a lower sort, and so are not in so great danger of damnation as the rest: even as the Scab is not so bad as the Morpew, nor the Morpew so mortal as the Elephantiasis, or the full Leprosie; though all are of kindred one to another.

9. *Pro.* Yet these better sort of Papists are commonly tainted with so much of their corruptions as makes their salvation much more difficult; so that we may well judge that it is fewer by far that are saved among them, then in the Reformed Churches. Even as it is possible for men to scape catching the Plague that live among the infected, and its possible for the infected to escape with their lives, but where one scapes many dye, and its I think more dan-

dangerous to live in an infected house or air than in a sound one.

Prop. 10. A man that cordially and practically receiveth the whole body of Popery, and so is a compleat Papist, is in so great danger of eternal damnation, as that it is a very hard question whether it be possible for him at the same time to hold cordially the fundamentals of Christianity, and so to be in a state of Salvation? Which because it is so hard a question that Protestant Divines are of different opinions about it, some thinking it possible for such to be saved, and some impossible, I will not presume here to determine it, seeing the matter in hand doth not call for the determination of it.

Prop. 11. Whosoever is saved among the Papists, whether he be more or less tainted with their errors, it is not *By Popery* that he is saved, but *from Popery*, or against it by the Christian faith. So that if a Papist may be saved, it must be as a Christian, and not as a Papist: Popery and Christianity having some contrariety; so that it must be by the prevalency and predominency of the Christian faith against Popery if ever he be saved. If a lyer might be saved it must not be by lying, but by faith in Christ and repentance. If a Leper, or one that hath the Plague, or the like diseases, may live, it must not be by the Leprosie or Plague that they must live; but by natural vigor and the help of Medicine by which they are preserved from the killing power of these diseases.

And here you may take notice; what a fond and vain delusion it is, by which the Priests do persuade the poor people that their Religion is a safer way to heaven than ours, even because that we confess a

Papist

Papist may be saved, but they affirm that a Protestant cannot be saved. For 1. Some Protestants think they may be saved, and some deny it. 2. Those that think they may be saved do withall think that it is not *by Popery*, but *against* it and *from* it. 3. And they think that its very hard, and therefore that they are very few that are saved among them, in comparison of the number saved among us. And is not this a fair and comfortable encouragement to their poor seduced followers, that some among us confess that as its possible for here and there one to escape of a raging Pestilence, so may some Papists be saved. 4. Their condemning of all Protestants doth make themselves worse, but it makes us never the worse, nor our case ever the more dangerous. Christ hath told us that all men shall know us to be his disciples, by Loving one another, and hath bid us, judge not that we be not judged, for with what judgement we judge, we shall be judged: and *Paul* tells us, that charity thinketh not evil, but hopeth all things: Is it then a good & Christian arguing to say that they are safer then we, because they are more censorious, and rash condemners of others? Then he that hath least Charity is of the safest Religion. Suppose that a company shut up in a Pesthouse, being raging mad with the Plague, or otherwise distempered in their brain, should cry out, that all the Town are sick and will certainly dye, except themselves. Were it wise reasoning now to say [You confess that some of those that are sick in the Pesthouse may escape; but they say that none of you that are out can escape, therefore it is safer to be with them then with you.] Even such is the reasoning of the Popish Priests in the present case. It is the disease of Popery that of its

its own nature causeth them to condemne all the world except themselves : And it is because we are free from their disease, that makes us not so rash and hasty in condemning them : But yet as charitable as we are to them, we are so charitable withall to our selves, that we would not be in their case, for all the world.

Prop. 12. We may well conclude therefore that whether a Papist may be saved or not, that certainly Popery is no safe way to Salvation.

If a cup of Poison be tempered for the killing of men, and one drinks it all, and dyeth, another drinks almost all, and dyeth, another drinks lesse, and yet using no remedy dyeth, another drinks but a little, or taking more, yet useth some effectual Remedy, and so with much ado scapeth death. I think, notwithstanding the scaping of these last, we may well conclude that [Poison is no safe or wholesome food.]

I come now to prove the Proposition last expressed.

In general 1. Popery is *No* way to salvation; Therefore it is no safe way. God hath nowhere prescribed it as a way to salvation; therefore it is not a way to salvation.

2. It is the way toward damnation, and from salvation; therefore it is no safe way to salvation.

The proof of all together shall be next fetcht from some general reasons drawn from the dangerous nature of Popery; For if I should descend to every particular error I must be voluminous, and do that which is sufficiently done by multitudes already.

Arg. 1.

Arg. 1. *Those doctrines which are founded upon a Notorious falshood, and resolved into it, are not a safe way to Salvation. But such are the doctrines which we call Popery: Therefore.*

For the Minor, They are founded on and resolved into the doctrine of the Popes Infallibility, or at least his Councils: This the Papists do confess and maintain. But that this is a Notorious falshood, is evident.

1. In that it is notorious that Popes have erred; and judicially erred, and erred in matters of faith. *Bellarmino* is put to answer to no less then fourty instances of erring Popes; and how shamefully or shamelessly he doth it, any Learned man that will search the records and peruse the case, may soon discover.

2. It is notorious that Councils have erred. I shall not now intermix my Testimonies to interrupt the plain course which I have begun, but rather give you the proof of all this distinctly by it self in the next disputation.

3. The Papists themselves confess this that we affirm. I mean, One part of them do confess that the Pope may err (as the *French*) and the other (the *Italians* and *Spaniards*) confess that a Council may erre. One saith the Infallibility is not seated in the Pope; and the other that it is not sealed in a Council, particular or general, of which see *Bellarmino de Conciliis lib. 2. cap. 10. & 11.* In which last he seeks to prove that a General Council may erre. 1. When they dissent from the Popes Legates. 2. And when they consent with the Legates, if those Legates

gates do cross the Popes instructions. 3. Yea if the Legates have no certain Instructions, the Council and all they, may consent in error: And he proves the two former by the instance of the second Council of *Ephesus*, and the *Constantinopolitane* Council in the time of Pope *Nicholas* the first, which erred, saith he, because the Popes Legates followed not his instructions. The third he proves by the Council of *Basil Sess. 2.* which together with the Popes Legate did by common consent Decree, that the Council is above the Pope, which now (saith *Bellarmino*) is judged erroneous.

4. Some Popes themselves have confessed that they are not the seat, or chief subject of the infallibility: As *Adrian* the sixth who hath wrote his judgement of it, that the Pope may err out of Council. And in my opinion we shall do the Pope much wrong if we shall not believe him when he speaks the truth, and tells us that he is fallible. Did *Bellarmino* better know Pope *Adrians* understanding, then the Pope knew his own? Surely I must do as I would be done by: and if any man should perswade me that I know that which I do not know, or that I am infallible, when I know my self subject to error. I should confidently expect that all men would rather believe me of my self then believe another of me that speaks the contrary: And so will I believe Pope *Adrian* that he was fallible.

But of this more in the next disputation; where you shall have fuller proof.

Arg. 2. If Popery do build even the Christian Religion it self (as held by them) on a foundation that is utterly uncertain, or else certainly false, then is it no safe way to salvation: For it would extirpate Christianity it self. But the Antecedent is true, as I shall thus prove.

1. They are divided and disagreed among themselves even their greatest Learned Doctors about the very foundation of their faith, as I shall further shew in the next argument: They believe upon the infallible judgement of the Church, and they are not agreed what that Church is.

2. They build the assurance of their faith upon such a ground as none of the common people, nor any Doctors in the world, can have the knowledge of: therefore their faith must needs be uncertain. To manifest this I shall review one leaf that I wrote heretofore on this subject in the Preface to the second Part of the *Saints Rest*.

It is the Authority of the Church they say, upon which we must believe that the Scriptures are the word of God, and were it not for the Churches authoritative affirmation, they would not believe it (saith one of them, no more than *Aesops* Fables) Now suppose they were agreed what this Church is, and that we now take notice of their more common opinion, that it is, all the Bishops of the Church headed by the Pope, or a General Council approved of and confirmed by the Pope, I would fain know how the faith of any of us that live at a distance, yea or of any man living, can be sure and sound, when all these following particulars must be first known,
before

before we can have such assurance. 1. It must be known that God hath given to the Church this power of judging what is his word, and what is a point of faith, and what not : so that that is so to us, which they judge so ; or that we are bound by God to believe them. Now which way doth God give the Church this Power? Is it not by Scripture, or unwritten tradition in their own judgment? And by what means doth he oblige us to Believe the Church in such determinations? It must be also by Scripture or unwritten Tradition by their own confession: For if they fly to universal Tradition, and natural obligation, they give up their cause, and let go their Authoritative Tradition and Obligation, as from their *Romane* Church. So that a man must (according to their doctrine) believe that the word of God (written or unwritten) hath given Power to the Church to determine what is the word of God before he can believe the word of God, or know it to be the word of God : that is, He must know and believe the word of God before he can know and believe it. Here is one of the impossibilities that lye at the very foundation of the *Romane* way of faith.

2. Before men can know the Scripture to be Gods word, yea or their supposed unwritten verities, infallibly, according to the *Romane* way of believing, they must first know that the Church is infallible in her judgement, and this also must be known by the word of God, which is supposed not to be known yet it self.

3. They must also know, that it is the Church of *Rome* in particular that is the true Church and hath this power given from God.

4. To this end they must know that all those perverted

verted Texts (or some of them) that speak of *Peters* own person, were also spoke of certain successors of his, as well as of himself (as that on them the Church shall be built, and their faith shall not fail, &c.)

5. They must know that the Pope is this successor of *Peter*.

6. To this end, they must not onely know that *Peter* was at *Rome* (of which read well *Ulricus Vellem* in *Goldastus*) and was Bishop there, but they must know that he was the only Bishop there, or at least the chief, and that *Paul* was no Bishop there (who is more likely to have been) or else that he was the inferior, and that the Pope is *Peters* successor and not *Pauls*; or else succeedeth them both, and hath his infallibility but from one, unless the successors of the rest of the Apostles are infallible too.

7. If *Peter* and *Paul* were Bishops at once of one Church in *Rome*, then it must be known why they may not have two successors at once; and if there be two, which of them is to be believed when they disagree. But if *Peter* and *Paul* were Bishops of two particular Churches in *Rome*, the one of the Circumcision, the other of the uncircumcision, then it must be known by what right their successors made them one? or whether it were not by a failing or cessation of the Church of the Circumcision, when all Jews were banished from *Rome*, and so the Church of the uncircumcision only continuing, the Pope be not only *Pauls* successor.

8. And it must be known whether *Peter* were not Bishop of other Churches as well as of *Rome* (yea of *Antioch* before *Rome*) and so whether the Bishop of *Antioch* be not his successor as well as the Pope of
Rome

Rome, yea and the chief successor if it follow the right of primogeniture, either as to the Church or the Bishop: seeing *Antioch* was a Church before *Rome*, and *Peter* was supposed to be Bishop then before he was of *Rome*. And then if the Bishop of *Rome* and *Antioch* differ (as they do) how shall we know whom to believe, and how shall we know the Bishop of *Antioch* is not infallible as well as the Pope of *Rome*?

9. It must be known what it is that makes a Pope, what is necessary to his being *Peters* successor. Is it enough that he step up into the chair and call himself Pope? Or that his party call him so? Then if any Heathen or *Arrian* conqueror, though a Lay man did so, he should be Pope. And he that conquers *Rome* may make himself *Saint Peters* infallible successor at any time. But if there must be an ordination and Election, then it must be known whether every Ecclesiastical Ordination or Consecration, and Election will serve or not. If it will, then when there have been three Popes chosen and consecrated at once, they were all *Saint Peters* infallible successors, though one condemned the other. If not, then it must be known, who it is that hath the power of election (which being the act that determineth of the person, is the maine that must resolve our doubts) and also of consecration or ordination. And how shall the people know this, when the Clergy have been so disagreed among themselves.

10. And here it must be known whether the Cardinals have the sole power to elect? If they have, then how came they by it? And then, whether were all those that were elected by the people in the first ages, and by the Emperors in after ages, true Popes,

or not: If they were not, then Saint *Peter* hath no successors, because of the interruption of the succession so long; and the Church had then no visible head. If they were, then the sufficient power is not onely in the Cardinals. And if it be not onely in them, then whether are any of those true Popes that have been chosen onely by them of late ages?

11. And so it must be known how a possibility of uninterrupted succession can be proved, when Popes have been chosen three several wayes, sometime by the people (or else there had not been so many slain at the election of *Damasus*, nor had the ancient Canons made this necessary to all Bishops) and sometime by the Presbyters of that Church, and sometime by the Emperors; and now by titular Presbyters, who are Bishops of other Churches, and are incapable of being true Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*. If all these several wayes of Election may make true Popes, then it seems any way may serve, and then the three Popes at once will be all true: If not, then there hath been an interruption of the succession, and so according to their own Principles, there can be now no true Pope.

12. And here it must needs be known too, whether there be any thing in the person that is a qualification so materially necessary, that he can be no true Pope without it. If not, then a Pagan or a Mahometan may be Pope. If there be, then it must be known what that is, which few private men at least do know.

13. Particularly it must be known whether they that are known Hereticks, yea judged so by Councils, or by their own successors, and those that were

notorious Whoremongers, Sodomites, Murderers, Poisoning their Predecessors to get the Popedom, Simonists, buying the Popedom with money, &c. were capable of being true Popes?

14. If they are not capable, then we must all know that all the Popes were none such, when the Papists themselves confess they were such, before we can know that they were the infallible successors of Saint Peter.

15. But if such may be Popes, then must we know why a Mahometane may not as well be a Pope? or how an enemy of Christ and the Church should come to be a Son of Promise, and the Vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church, and whether such were infallible in their judging falshood to be truth, as they did?

16. And we must know, that the Pope only is lawless, and under no power of Canons, or Decrees of former Popes and Councils? Or else many such Canons will proclaim their calling null: and so the succession still hath been interrupted. And if the Authority of the former Church oblige the Pope to believe, e.g. the truth of Scripture and Traditions, then why must not the Authority of the former Church in its Canons be as obligatory to him in point of duty and penalty, and so null his calling?

17. *Bellarmino* saith that it is agreed among all Catholiks that the Pope as a private Doctor may erre through ignorance, even in universal questions of faith: Also that many Papists and Pope *Alexander* the sixth himself taught that the Pope as Pope may be a Heretick, and teach Heresie, so it be without a General Council: And that most of the

st do only hold, that whether the Pope be a Heretic or not, yet he cannot define any thing heretical, as to be believed by the whole Church: this is the most common opinion; *Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontif. li. 4. cap. 2.*

Now this being so we must be resolved, if a Pope be a Heretic in heart, and open profession, and if a General Council be called, this Pope cannot give his sentence in it according to his own belief, whether indeed we can prove that God hath promised to cause a Hereticke Pope to dissemble, and to speak against his own judgement, which is to lye, though the thing that he saith be true, or yet to lye on his tongue that he shall not be able to speak that which he believes, and speaks at other times?

18. And whether the promise which they alledge for this purpose (I have prayed for thee that thy faith shall not) be indeed fulfilled to a Heretical Pope. If it be, then its evident that this promise belongs not to all Popes. If yea, then the faith of a Hereticke shall not fail; which *Bellarmino* himself confesseth to be false. And here note what a naked shameful shift it is that *Bellarmino* makes about this text? He saith that [*There are two things promised there to Peter: The first is that Peter should never lose the true faith, though tempted by the Devil; The other priviledge is, that he as Pope should not be able ever to teach any thing contrary to the faith; or that in his seat no man should ever be found that should teach against the faith: of which priviledges, the first perhaps was not derived to his successors, but the second undoubtedly derived to them*] So saith *Bellarmino de Rom. Pontif. li. 4. cap. 3.*

Now mark how contrary this is to the sense of the

text. The promise that Christ made to *Peter*, was not to his tongue but to his heart: not that he should not speak against the faith, for he did deny Christ, and curse and swear that he knew not the man: but it was that his inward belief should not fail, and that he should not fall from Christ, and consequently indeed that his heart should reduce the tongue to itself. Now *Bellarmino* confesseth that perhaps the part of the promise that concerneth faith it self reacheth not to *Peters* successors, but onely that which concerneth the tongue: which was directed none at all; so that he gives up the true promise made to *Peter*, which was that his faith should not fail, and not that his tongue should not fail, and forgeth another in its stead.

19. How can we be assured that this or any promise belongeth to the Popes, when the Papists themselves say that they were made to *Peter* before he was Pope. For so *Bellarmino* is fain to answer, when we say *Peter* himself erred in denying Christ, he saith [*Saint Peter when he denyed Christ, was yet made Pope: For its manifest that the Ecclesiastical supremacy was given him in the last of John, when Christ after the resurrection bid him Feed my sheep* Bell. de Pontif. li 4. cap. 8.

20. It is of necessity that all Christians who believe upon the Popes authority, must know who it is that is the true Pope, and to be believed: And when there are many Popes at once pretending to that fallibility and authority, how can all Christians be resolved which is the true Pope when one Country owns one, and another owns another, whom the vulgar own that are out of reach and incapable of understanding the quarrel? And then, what

knows which of them must be succeeded by the next? Nay can learned men tell? Nay can the Cardinals tell that choose them? And are we sure that any of the pretenders are true Popes? Shall we hear *Bellarmino* in one particular case, that is in his answer to the 37. instance of Heretical Popes, to wit, *John 23.* who besides open Adulteries, Murders and other horrid wickedness, of which no less then fifty three Articles were put in against him at the Council of *Constance*, all confirmed, saith *Bellarmino*, by certain witnesses, he was moreover accused of most pernicious Heresie, even of denying the Resurrection of the body, and everlasting life. And to this *Bellarmino* answereth [*Joannem 23. non fuisse Pontificem omnino certum & indubitatum, proinde non necessario esse defendendum, erant enim eo tempore tres, qui Pontifices haberi volebant, Gregor. 12. Benedict. 13. & Johan. 23. nec poterat facile judicari quis eorum verus ac legitimus esset Pontifex cum non desset singulis doctissimi patroni.*] that is [I answer that *John the 23.* was not altogether the certain and undoubted Pope, and therefore he is not necessarily to be defended, for there were at that time three that would be accounted Popes, *Gregor. 12. Benedict. 13. and John 23.* and it was no easie matter to judge which of them was the true and lawful Pope, when there were wanting to each one of them most Learned Patrons.] And yet the same *Bellarmino* saith, *de Conoil. li. 1. cap. 8.* that its almost the common opinion that this *John, Alex 5.* were true Popes.

You see then the case of the poor people according to the Romish Religion: They cannot know the word of God to be his word but on the authoritative determination of the Pope: and who is the

true Pope it is impossible for them to know, when even most Learned men cannot know, and *Bellarmin* himself so long after saith, it could not easily be known.

21. Moreover, how can all Christians many hundred miles distant know whether indeed the Cardinals chose and consecrated him that is in the seat, or whether he forc'd in himself, or bribed them to pretend what was not done, and so whether he have all the essentials of his call.

22. And if a Council must be the determiner either with the Popes, or alone, How shall the Christian world know that Christ hath promised infallibility to a Council, when there is no such promise in the word: much less can Infidels know this in order to their believing the word of God.

23. And how shall we all know what is a General Council, and when we have one? whether it must be all the Christian Bishops in the world that must meet? or the delegates at least of all? or whether some Countries, or part of all may serve? and then what Countries or parts it must be? *Bellarmin. de Conc. l. 1. c. 17.* Saith, that once the Patriarchs must be present, but now its not necessary because they are all Hereticks or Schismatics. And how shall we know that ever there was such a thing as a General Council? For my part I see no probability that ever there were many, if any one such Council, was the Council of *Trent* General when the greatest part of the Christian world was absent? When all the Bishops of *Aethiopia, Egypt, Palestine, Greece*, with all the Turkes dominions were absent, besides the Protestants, and most of the Popish Bishops themselves.

24. How shall we be sure that all these, or the greater

greater part of them are true Bishops and lawfully called? If as *Bellarmino* saith *de Concil. l. 2. c. 9.* That the contrary be not manifest, be enough, then mans error can make Gods promise of Infallibility belong to those that it was never made to; or else God hath promised infallibility to all that may be Popes or Bishops for ought we know: and then it belongs not to the Pope and Bishops, but to all that seem such.

25. Yea that all those Bishops or most descend by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, which is made necessary, If they plead onely the Bishop of *Romes* succession to warrant all the rest, before the forementioned particulars be well answered, it will appear that *Romes* succession hath been frequently interrupted.

26. How shall men at a distance be sure that the Councils are indeed confirmed by the Pope?

27. How shall we be sure when all is done that we have the right sence of the Canons or Decrees of such Councils, when they speak as ambiguously as the Scripture, and the Papists think they can have no certainty of the right sence of that without a living judge: And if there be a living judge still of the sence of Councils, either he is as infallible as they, or not: If not, then he cannot make us infallibly certain by his Authoritative determination. If he be, then what need of a Council, when he is infallible alone?

28. When several Popes and Councils contradict one another, how shall we know which of them to believe? And this is no rare matter among them?

29. When the Pope and Council contradict each other, how shall the people know which is infallible?

30. When both Pope and Council contradict the express Scripture, must we take them for infallible, and believe that Scripture only on their words.

These or most of these must be known by all Christians, before they can believe the Articles of their Creed, or that Scripture is Gods word, according to the *Romish* grounds: When as it is impossible for any man to know them as true; they being either false or not evident and demonstrable. So that its now apparent that according to the Popish grounds, the People can have no certainty of the truth of their Religion, and that they shake the foundation of Christianity it self.

2. And lastly, not onely so, but they build on a foundation certainly false, that is, the Popes infallibility or a Councils: as I shall prove in the next dispute where their fallibility will be further manifested.

Arg. 3. *If the Papists are not agreed among themselves either Clergy or Laity about the very fundamentals of their faith (or matters which they make of necessity to salvation) then Popery is no safe way to salvation: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore, &c.*

We need to go no further for the proof of the Antecedent then to what is said already. They commonly maintain that we must receive our faith and the Scriptures upon the Authority of the infallible Church: and they are not yet agreed among themselves, nor ever like to be what that infallible Church is. And the difference is not with a few inconsiderable dissenters, but in their main body. The Papists of *France* maintain that it is a General

ral Council that is infallible, and that the Pope is fallible: The *Italians* maintain that a General Council is fallible, and the Pope is infallible. Some others think that both of them are fallible separated, but both infallible when they concur. And some think that they are both infallible though separated. If the Church be the foundation, and all must be received upon its infallible authority, then no man can be saved that knows not which this infallible Church is: either therefore the *French* or *Italians*, one part or the other of them do erre in their very fundamentals, when one saith, *This is the subject of infallibility*, and the other say, *This is it*. And if a Pope or General Council differ, to whom must the people hearken? One part of them saith that the Pope is above the Council; and others of them say the Council is above the Pope, and of this mind have been General Councils themselves, as the Council of *Basil* and *Constance*, and of this mind *Bellarmino* names, Cardinal *Cameracensis*, Cardinal *Cusanus*, *Joh. Gerson*, *Iac. Almain*, Card. *Florentin*, *Panormitan*, &c.

What a strange impudency then is it of these men, to make the silly deluded people among us believe, that they are all of one mind, and its we that are divided: when as they are never likely to agree in their very principles and great fundamental, *Who it is that is the infallible Judge?* And till men know *Who it is*, what the better are they to know, that such a judge there is seeing that the species existeth only in the individual, and no man can believe him, or apply himself to him as the infallible judge, till he know that it is he indeed that is such.

See-

Seeing then according to their own principles, either the *French* Papists or the *Italian* and *Spanish* Papists must be in the way to damnation, how shall we know which it is and which to joyn our selves to with any safety? Were it not for weakening the Popes interest, they would burn the *French* Papists as Hereticks as well as us.

Arg. 4. *If Popery be a new devised way to heaven such as the Apostles never knew nor the Church after them for many a hundred year (in the main parts of Popery) then is it no safe way to salvation: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent.*

The consequence they will not deny, that which the Apostles & the Primitive Churches went in is only the safe way to heaven (for there are not many safe ways) But that which the Papists as Papists go in, is not that which the Apostles and Primitive Church went in: therefore it is not the safe way. And that the Apostles and first Churches knew not Popery, but it is a new Religion, or new corruption of Religion, appeared by comparing the particular points with Scripture and Antiquity: For Scripture which is the truest Antiquity, it may give any indifferent man just cause of suspicion that the Papists do so obstinately refuse to be tryed by it; which plainly shewes that they take it not to be on their side. And for the Councils and Fathers, for the first three hundred years or much more, they ordinarily scorn us for mentioning them to this end, because they say they wrote not of the points now in controversie, and therefore are unfit to determine them. But did not those ages take up their faith on the same grounds as we should do now?

And

And can they be all silent about the onely ground of faith? If the Pope of *Romes* infallible authority had been the ground, would they not have told us so? How could they convert the infidels, and confirm believers without acquainting them with the grounds of their Faith? And what they took for the grounds their writings shew. Nay he that shall faithfully and impartially peruse the Writers of the first three- or four or seven hundred years, is blind if he see not the novelty of Popery, and in particular of the Popes infallibility, universal headship and Episcopacy, and his pretended authority to be the Judge of controversies, with the rest of his usurpations. Our Divines, *Chamier*, *Jewel*, *Usher*, *Field*, and many others have manifested this so largely, that it would be superfluous for me to do it after them, and somewhat will necessary fall in with the next dispute.

I do not deny but that many ceremonies, and many controverted doctrines were very ancient: as the use of Chrisme, and a white garment, and milke and honey to the newly baptized, exorcisme, confirmation by imposition of hands, the Memories of the Martyrs, with prayers and praises at their graves, or places of suffering; the oft use of the signe of the Cross, the observation of *Lent* (as well as *Easter* and *Whitsontide*) not to kneel on the Lords day, not to eat things strangled or bloody, so the doctrines of the power of Free-will, and predestination upon foreseen faith, and the misuse of the terms [*Merit and Justification*] the denial of the perseverance of all Saints, &c. were too early and commonly entertained. But these be not the things that we call Popery, nor wherein the great difference

ence between us, and the *Romanists* doth consist. But as for the great points in difference between the Papists and us, it is so evident in all antiquity, that Popery is a novelty, and that they have devised a new way to heaven which the Apostles and the Churches for many hundred years did never know, that onely gross ignorance of the Churches records, or a willingness to be deceived, can keep men from the knowledge of it.

And here I might easily prove what is said of the novelty of Popery, even from the confessions of their own most learned writers, that so they may not say, it is concluded from our own misunderstanding of Antiquity; But that it would swell this disputation beyond the intended bulk and bounds. I shall onely give a brief touch in a few points of moment, which may shew you what to think of their charging us with novelty, and of their general pretences to Antiquity.

Of the humane Ordination of Papacy, and its late increase beyond its ancient bounds, and the limitation of Ecclesiastical Power; I shall desire you to see what in the following Disputation is cited out of their Cardinal *Nicol. Cusanus*, a man so violent for the *Eugenian* faction, that *Aeneas Sylvius*, afterward Pope *Pius* the second lamenteth that so learned a man should be the pillar of that Popes cause; and a man so close to Papal interest, and so addicted himself to domineering, that he opposed his Prince *Sigismund* Duke of *Austria*, and caused the same Pope *Pius* the second to take his part, and excommunicate *Sigismund* and all his Counsaillors, and his subjects, for taking this Cardinal prisoner
by

by force of Armes; of which see the story in *Goldsmit*, with *Gregor. Hemburg's* (one of the Princes excommunicated Counsaillors.) his Defence against the Pope and Cardinal: Yet this man himself in his books *de concordia* hath confessed enough to destroy the Popes cause, and take down the *Romane* tyranny, if they would stand to the principles of that confession.

Others also in the next disputation are mentioned as to that subject, which I shall therefore now pretermitt.

Polidore Virgil a Learned writer of theirs in his lib. 8. *de Invent. Rer. cap. 5. pag. 475. 476.* Saith [Item ut nullum conventum indici, nullumque a quibusvis actum haberi ratum liceret sine Romani Pontificis auctoritate; Marcellus primus omnium sanxit, deinde Julius & Damasus & Gregorius illud idem statuerunt] [i. e. [Also that no Assembly (or Council) should be called, nor any act of whomsoever be esteemed ratified without the Authority of the Pope of Rome, this Marcellus was the first that did ordain, and afterward Julius and Damasus and Gregory did ordain the same thing] And though this sufficiently proveth the novelty, yet *Polidore* is mistaken in taking this part of Papal Usurpation to be so ancient. For he took it on the authority of the decretals, which are meer fictions.

Of which I refer the Reader to

Blondellus de Decretal. The sum

of whose censure on *Marcellus*

Epistles is this [As the fre-

quent Barbarisme shew the

Author, so the following of the version of

Hiereme, the exscribing of divers instances

out

Blondell. de Decret.
pag. 397. 403.

out of *Innocent, Leo, Hilary, Gregory, Adrian 1. and Acacius*, shew that he was many ages later then *Marcellus*] See also the full evidence that he giveth in his censures against the Epistle of *S. Julius and Damasus*; and for *Gregory*, his Epistles to the contrary purpose are well known. So that by *Polidorus* confession this Papal usurpation is a novelty: but indeed many hundred years neerer then he imagined.

And what good this usurpation did, himself confesseth in the following words [*Though it first broke the conventicles of Hereticks --- Ita deinceps nihil attulit commodi. cum per id jam pene desitum sit a concilis habendis, in quibus cuncta ex aequo tractarentur Pontifice, Romano ejusmodi negotium non magnopere curante*] i. e. [Afterwards it did no good, When by reason of this, Councils are almost ceased, in which all things should be equally handled; the Pope of Rome not much regarding any such matter] Where he addeth [That therefore Pope Martin the fifth in the Council of Constance decreed that a Council should be called every tenth year, which hitherto hath not been kept, and therefore Religion grows daily worse] Where by the way we may see what power the Laws of the Pope and General Councils have, and what a Religion Popery is, which sweareth men to believe and obey the Decrees of such Councils, which no man ever obeyed since they were made: For there hath been never since a Decennial Council: And the Pope himself by confirming that Council which decreed that a Council is above the Pope, did shew himself obliged to obey it, and so to have called a Council accordingly. But all others must swear to that as Gods Word and infallible, which themselves contemne. But to proceed. The

The same *Polidore Virgil*. lib. 8. cap. 1. g. 456. shews that the beginning of Indulgences was not till *Gregory* appointed his stations, and made them a reward. And shewing that thy were grounded on the Doctrine of Purgatory, he bringeth in Bishop *Fisher* of *Rocheſter* to witneſs, 1. That Indulgences are lately brought in. 2. And that even of Purgatory *Apud priſcos*

Roffenſ. Cont. Luthernm.

nulla vel quam rariffima fiebat mentio; ſed & Grecis ad hunc uſque diem non eſt creditum eſſe: quan diu enim nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura, nemo queſiuit indulgentias, nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum eſtimatio. Si tollas purgatorium, quorſum indulgentiarum opus erit? Ceperunt igitur Indulgentia, poſtquam ad purgatorii cruciatu aliquandiu trepidatum eſt] i. e. [With the ancients there was no mention of Purgatory, or exceeding rare: And the Greeks believe not that it is to this day: And as long as there was no care about Purgatory, no man ſought for indulgences; for all the eſtimation of indulgences dependeth upon that. If you take away Purgatory, what uſe is there of indulgences: indulgences therefore did then begin, when men had trembled a while at the pains of Purgatory] So far Bishop *Fisher* their Mar-tyre.

See Mr. *Sing's* Re-joynder in Deſenſ. of Bishop *Uſher* p. 78. 79, 80, 81, &c.

Polidore Virgil reciting theſe words, next to them addeth [*Qua tu forte cum tanti ſint Momenti, ut magis certa ex ore Dei expectabas*] [Perhaps you expected to have had theſe things as more certain from the mouth of God, ſeeing they are of ſuch moment] A ſufficient hint that he had more in his mind if he durſt have ſpoken out.

Yet

Yet note that the profit of indulgences is expressly sworn to in the new *Trent* Creed as part of their Belief.

This passage of *Fishers* was alledged by Bishop *Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, and the like from *Cajetans* confessing that the beginning of indulgences is not known: What the adversaries can say against these citations, you may see confuted by Mr. *Sing* in his Rejoynder in Defence of Bishop *Usher* against the Jesuite, pag. 81. 82, 83.

That the use of the Sacrament in one kind is a new invention, is commonly confessed by them. See *Albaspinaus* a sober Bishop of theirs in his observations, after his notes on *Optatus*, cap. 4. de *Communione Laica*, pag. 10. 11. shewing the novelty of the now *Romish* Communion. And *Gregor. de Valentia* the Jesuite confesseth that *minime constat*, it is not known when the custome of receiving the Sacrament in one kind onely began, but that it was not by any Decree of a Bishop, but crept in by some custome of the people. Of which also see Bishop *Usher* *ibid.* and his Defender Mr. *Sing* p. 78. 82, 83.

About the beginning of Monckery, see *Polidors Virgils* confess. lib. 7. cap. 1. pag. 414. 415. 416. And that [*Monachi prima omnium introduxerunt in Ecclesiam Dei vota sacra, & vestimenta profana simul religiosa fecerunt*] [*Monkes were the first of all men that brought into the Church of God, sacred vows, and made common (or profane) garments become Religious.*] pag. 424.

Of the beginning of forbidding Priests to marry, see the same *Polid. Virgil.* li. 5. cap. 4. pag. 293, &c.

Of Peters supremacy the same Polidore saith l. 4. c. 6. p. 240. [*Veruntamen existunt etiam nunc, &c.* There are some now that contend that Peter had power over all the Apostles: of which it belongeth not to us to determine, who are onely enquiring of the original of Priesthood: but some think the contrary, because Paul seemeth to deny it, &c.] Where he addeth more reasons.

Of the Original of Cardinals, and the changes of the Electors of Popes, see him also l. 4. c. 9. where also he saith pag. 252. [*Verum cum postea Bonifacium 3. ab Imperatore Phoca impetrasset ut in omnes Episcopos prerogativam haberet, omniumque caput perpetuo foret, jam tum Romanus Pontifex multo quam antea unam cum suo urbano sacerdotum senatu cunctis sine controversia prestare autoritate caput, ac simul illi presbyteri quibus Tituli dati, quibus Christianorum animas curandi munus delatum fuerat, eo Cardinalium nomine velut suprema illius dignitatis proprio cum primis honestari caput.*] Here you have a hint of the Original of the very new frame of the Romish Church.

Many more points of the Romish way doth he in that Book discover to be novel. And in opposition to all their way if you will see how he describeth the Reformed Religion, peruse his narrative of the occasion of the Reformation, pag. 410. cap. 4. li. 8. where he saith [*Ita licentia parva loquendi: secta brevi tempore mirabiliter crevit qua Evangelica dicta est eo quod, haud ullam asseveret recipiendam esse legem qua ad animarum salutem pertineat nisi quam Christus aut Apostoli dedissent*] i. e. [Having once leave to speak, that sect did marvailously increase; which is called Evangelical, because they

I affirm

affirm that no Law is to be received which belongeth to salvation but what is given by Christ or the Apostles] Thus you see what the Protestant Religion is and whence called Evangelical, and wherein it principally differeth from Popery, from the mouth of a Papist himself (an Agent of the Popes with the King of England H. 7. An Archdeacon, and at last the Dean of Pauls in London, from whence he removed because of the entrance of the English changes under H. 8)

And though he say that it then begun, meaning Luthers particular Reformation, yet what is like to be the end of it in the next words he subjoynes his Prognostick [*Mansurum ut videtur quoad Christum ipse populum suum culpâ rectorum ita in duas sectas scjunctum, rursus coegerit, a quo istud optimum quisque maxime petere precarique debet, ut ne major indidem fiat Religionis labes*] [Its like to remain till Christ himself shall again bring together his people,

* Note that he calls the Papists a Sect as well as the Reform. ed.

Who by their Rectors fault are thus divided into two * Sects; from whom every good man ought especially to beg and pray for it, lest Religion do daily decay] more and more.

The novelty of their doctrine *de efficaciâ Sacramenti ex opere operato* is not onely by subtile Scotus but many more of their own confessed to be new. More of their corruptious are by their own Writers confessed to be novelties; and therefore it is great immodesty in the Papists to pretend the Antiquity of Popery, though we easily grant them the Antiquity of their Christianity. In so much as they agree with us they may prove

prove their Religion to be ancient: but its new in the points wherein we differ, and most new in the greatest differences. Bishop *Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, and in his book *de Statu & Successione Ecclesiarum*, hath proved the novelty of the main body of their corruptions, especially the points of whose antiquity themselves most boasted of, and this distinctly and fully to their perpetual confusion, beyond all reply.

If therefore the Romanists would have us return to their communion (not to their subjection; for that we never owed them) let them but cast off their novelties and return to the ancient faith and practice of the *Roman* Church, and we shall do it speedily and do it gladly: They shall see that we are so far from affecting an unnecessary separation, that we will embrace them in a lawful communion with all our hearts. I cannot better express my hearty desires of this, then in those hearty words of *Hier. Zanchy* Vol. 3. *Thes. de Eccles. Milit. Thes. 19. Col. 40.* [*Non enim ab Ecclesia Romanâ simpliciter & omnibus defecimus: sed in illis duntaxat rebus in quibus ipsa defecit ab Apostolica, atque adeo a seip-
sa, veteri & pura Ecclesia: neque alio discessimus
nimo, quam ut si correctâ, ad priorem Ecclesiæ for-
mam redeat, nos quoque ad illam revertamur, &
communione cum illa in suis porro catibus habeamus:
Quod ut tandem fiat, toto animo Domino Jesum pre-
catur, Quid enim pio cuique optatius, quam ut ubi
per baptismum renati sumus, ibi etiam in finem us-
que vivamus? modo in Domino? Ego Hier. Zanchius.
Cum tota mea familia testatum hoc volo toti Ecclesiæ
Christi in omnem eternitatem.*

Arg. 5. If Popery do make a new Catholike Church, which was never known for many hundred years after Christ, then is it no safe way to salvation. But Popery doth make a new Catholike Church that was never known of many hundred years after Christ: therefore its no safe way to salvation.

The consequence of the Major will not be denied; for they confels that Christs Church is but one; He had not a Church of one sort for the first ages, and a Church of another sort since: though its accidents may vary, yet so doth not its essence. The Minor I prove thus, That which the Papists make to be the Catholike Church, is only all those Christians that acknowledge the Pope to be the universal Bishop and head of the Catholike Church, having universal supreme jurisdiction, and the Church of *Rome* to be the Mother and Mistris of all other Churches, and its only a Catholike Church convertible with the *Romane* Church. But such a Catholike Church as this was never known by the Apostles, or of many hundred years after Christ: Therefore Popery maketh a new Catholike Church, which the first ages never knew.

Its true that when *Rome* being then the ruling City of the world did come to own Christianity, that the Glory of the Empire occasioned the Bishop to be called *Prima sedis Episcopus*, as one that was to take place of the rest of the Patriarchs, who had their several orders or places assigned them (as *Alexandria* to be the second, *Antioch* the third, &c.) which *Bellarmin* confesseth might be after lawfully changed: but as *Alexandria* had not the Government of *Antioch* by that precedence, so neither had *Rome* any government, of the rest: And as *Constantinople* was afterward set up

above

above *Alexandria* and *Antioch* (and claimed to be above *Rome*) so might it as lawfully have been set up above *Rome*. But what ever be said about their quarrels of precedency, which pride begun and cherished, yet its most evident in all antiquity, that of many hundred years after Christ, there was no such Catholike Church in being, or known, as was centred in the Pope as the head or universal Bishop or Governor, or in *Rome* as the Mistris of the rest. We have long ago challenged them to give us the least proof of such a Church in all antiquity, and they give us nothing, but such forced passages that are nothing to their purpose, that its hard for the most charitable rational man to believe that they do indeed believe themselves, and do not know that they hypocritically endeavor to cheat poor souls by their vain cavils. All the Papists on earth will never be able to answer what our Divines have said already to prove the novelty of their Papal headship: nor can all the Popes servants in the world bring us one word of currant antiquity for many hundred years after Christ, to prove that ever such a Church was once dreamed of, as they now call the *Romane* Catholike Church. Indeed *Rome* was called then, a Catholike Church, and so was *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and all that held the Catholike faith, and were not heretical: but it was never known till *Boniface* had usurped the Title of universal Bishop above 600. years after Christ (which he procured by *Phocas* a Murderer that usurped the Empire when he had slain the Emperor *Mauritius*) that the *Romane* Church and the Catholike Church was all one, or that it was necessary to make any particular Church or person Catholike, that they acknowledge the universal headship and jurisdiction of the *Romane* Pope, much less his infallibility.

To heap up Records here would but stop the plain Reader in his course; and somewhat shall be said of it in the next dispute: Onely I now say, that if any one question whether indeed the *Roman* Catholike Church as now constituted be a meer novelty, I here offer my self to the fuller proof of it, and shall desire no better recreation of such a sort then to entertain a dispute about it with any Papists that will undertake their cause.

And here I must needs annex this observation; What a shameless cheat it is by which the Papists do delude the ignorant, perswading them that theirs is the old Religion, and the ancient Church which hath continued from the Apostles without interruption; and that we are men of a new Religion, and of a Church that had never a visible being till the dayes of *Luther*, *Costerus* the Jesuite in the Preface to his *Enchiridion* instructeth his deluded novices how to deal with the Protestants by urging them with three Questions (which we shall resolve anon to his shame) and the last of them is a challenge to us. [To name one man before *Luther* that agreed with us in all things] But we challenge, and most confidently challenge all the Papists on earth to name one man for three hundred years after Christ (I might say six hundred years) that agreed with them (not in all things but) in their very Articles of Faith, yea in their Church fundamentals, yea in the very definition of the Catholike Church: We challenge them to name us one man and (prove it) that ever knew or owned such a Church as Catholike that is now so called and owned by them. We confidently affirm (and challenge all the Papists in the world to dispute the point with us) that their Church as Po-
pists

pish, is a new thing, unknown to our forefathers of the first ages; that Popery is a sardel of new doctrines, unknown to the first Churches. We admire at the immodesty of these men to aske us where our Church was before *Luther*, and to call it a new Religion which we profess, and to ask us whether we think our selves wiser then all the world was heretofore in the purest times? We do most confidently return on them their own demands? We would know from any of them where their Church was for three hundred (yea for six hundred) years after Christs birth? And we wonder how they can think to be saved in a way that was not known for so long time? Do they think themselves wiser then Christ and his Apostles, and all the Christian world for so many hundred years. Again we challenge them to shew us the least proof that ever there was such a thing for so long time, as a Catholike Church convertible with the *Romane*, and headed by the Pope as the universal Bishop having a universal jurisdiction over the rest, or an infallible Judgement in determining of controversies in matters of faith. It is none of the least of our Reasons why we dare not be of the *Romish* faction or opinions, called by them their Church and their Religion, because it is so new, and we dare not venture our souls upon new wayes, nor dare we believe that Christ hath two sorts of Churches essentially different since his Resurrection; one sort before the Popes universal headship, and the other since: nor dare we once imagine that Christ had no true Church on earth till Pope *Boniface* would needs be the universal Bishop, or till *Rome* was advanced to the dignity and titles which it doth now usurpe. I desire no better issue then this

of our difference : Let any Papists living bring out their cause to the tryal of antiquity, and let them that are of the most Ancient Church and Religion, carry the cause. If we prove not theirs new and ours the most ancient, or if they prove theirs more Ancient then ours (as since Christs Resurrection) then we are contented to be of their Church and way.

Arg. 6. If the Papists be the greatest Schismaticke upon earth, most desperately rending the Church and separating themselves from the maine body of the visible Church, then Popery is not a safe way to salvation. But the Papists are the greatest Schismaticke on earth, most desperately rending the Church, and separating themselves from the main body thereof : Therefore Popery is no safe way to salvation.

The consequences of the Major will be confessed by themselves. It is only the Minor, therefore that is to be proved : which is too easily done, being a matter of fact.

First, The Papists do actually rend themselves from the greatest part of Christs Church on earth, condemning all others to everlasting fire : 2. They do lay the grounds of a continual schisme, in making a new center of the unity of the Church : of these two in order.

1. He that shall consider of all the Christians in the world at this day, who subject not themselves to the Pope of Rome, and may truly be reputed to be of the Catholike Church, will see that the Papists are but a small part of the Church : But especially if we consider them as they were not many ages ago, much more numerous then now they be. The Grecians, the Syrians called Melchites, the Moscovites and

Russians, the *Georgians*, all of the *Greek Religion* besides the multitude of the same Religion dispersed throughout the *Turkes dominions*; also the *Abassins*, *Egyptians*, *Armenians*, *Jacobites*, who are neer of a mind, and differ from the *Papists*, and submit not to their authority: Besides all the Reformed Churches in *Germany*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Hungary*, *Transylvania*, *Brittain*, *Ireland*, *France*, *Belgia*, *Helvetia*, and other parts with those in the *Indies*; I say consider of all these Christians together and it will appear that the *Papists* are but a few to them, or not neer so many as they. But if you further consider of the state of the Christian world not many ages ago, when the *Turkes* had not yet subdued the Eastern parts, and when the *Abassian Empire* was much more large, and *Nubia* and other Countries had not revolted, it will appear that we may well say that it was but a small part of Christians comparatively that did acknowledge the universall headship and jurisdiction of the Pope, or submit themselves to him: besides many other points of Religion in which they differ from him. I know that the *Papists* say, that these are all either *Hereticks* or *Schismatics*, and so no part of the *Catholike Church*. But the accusation of *Schisme* is the meer voice of *Schisme*, and for *Heresie*, its true that all men and Churches have their errors, which yet deserve not the name of *Heresie*: The *Jacobites* and the rest that are neer them, are afraid of acknowledging two Natures in Christ, lest it lead them to make two persons with the *Nestorians*; but yet they are not plaine *Eutichites*: and both they and the *Nestorians* acknowledge Christ to be perfect God and perfect man; only the *Nestorians* do amiss
name

have these two natures, *two persons*; and that the Euticheans in flying too far from them are afraid to call them two Natures, though they confess the Godhead and Manhood to be really distinct; yet they say that both are as it were conjoynd or coupled into one Nature: so that wise impartial men think that the Eutichites (or at least these Christians that are so called amiss by the Papists) do but misuse the term *Nature* for the term *Person*, and so deny two *Persons* onely in sence, and two *Natures* onely in name, and that by the same misuse of the terms the Nestorians do affirm two *Natures* onely in sence, and two *Persons* in words onely. Of this I desire the Reader to consider What *Luther* hath said *de Conciliis*. This I must needs say, that if I did not exercise the same charity in judging of the Romanists, as I do in this excuse of the Jacobites, and other Christians that are not of their Communion, I should be forced to censure the former much deeper then the latter, and if by all their errors I must hold the rest to be Hereticks or Schismaticks, I must by the same measure judge the Romanists to be doubly Heretical, as I certainly know them to be most notoriously Schismatical. For though I know that they are not so barbarous and unlearned as most of these forementioned Christians, and also that they are free from many of their mistakes, yet withall they have many more in stead of them which the other are free from. And for the Protestants they are Hereticks only on this supposition, that the Pope be Judge.

By this time then it partly appeareth how great a part of the Church of Christ the Papists do differ from.

But

But yet this is not all, nay the smaller part. For if you will but consider the state of the Church of Christ for the first three hundred, yea five or six hundred years, you will find that the Papists do differ from them all, even from the whole Church. For then the Popes universal Episcopacy and jurisdiction was not known in the world (as is said before.)

All these doth the *Romane* party now separate themselves from: All these they do pronounce to be no true Churches or true Christians, but Hereticks and Schismatics: All these do they condemn to the pit of Hell. They have now concluded that onely those are of the true Church, that acknowledge the Mastership or universal Headship of the Pope, and the Mistreship of the particular *Romane* Church which none of all those forementioned did. They now conclude that none can be saved but who are of this (new-framed) Church of theirs.

Now I do appeal to any reasonable impartial man alive, whether there be any more notorious Schismatics on earth, then these men; that dare unchurch the far greatest part of Christs Church on earth at present, & the far purest, and renounce communion with them all, and proclaim them Hereticks or Schismatics, and sentence them all to the flames of Hell: Yea that dare do the like by all ages of Christians that have gone before them; yea that dare unchurch and damne to Hell the whole Church of Christ for many hundred years! For what do they less when they unchurch and damne all that acknowledge not their new made universal Bishop which the Primitive Church never did? And when they make that to be essential to the Catholike Church which

which the first Catholike Church did never know? I know there be some Enthusiasts and Anabaptists and such giddy persons, that do as the Papists do, condemn all the Churches of Christ except themselves. But yet the Schisme that they have made hereby is nothing to that which was made by the Papists, who have set the Christian world into a flame of dissention, and make it their very business daily to blow it up; and do nourish so many Colledges of Jesuites and other orders to that end.

What notorious impudency is it then in these men to tell us that we are schismatics, & separate from them and aske us, how we dare judge all our forefathers to damnation, and why we will not be of our forefathers Religion? and do not observe how they condemn themselves by all these questions. What more evident then that the Papists have separated from all other Christians in the world? How dare they condemn the far greatest part of Christians on earth to eternal torment? yea and (by plain consequence, though they will not acknowledge it) the whole Church of Christ for many hundred years? were it but one soul that they should presume to censure, they might well bethink them of an answer to *Pauls* Question, Who art thou that judgest another mans servant? to his own master doth he stand or fall, When *Paul* wrote that to the Church at *Rome*, he knew of none then that would justifie the judging of all the world, and say, They are my servants, or subjects, and therefore I must judge them. Do the blind Papists think that any sober considerate impartial Christian can be of their mind, and damne the most of Christs Church on earth, meerly because they will not be subject to the Pope of *Rome*. If this Article be so necessary to salvation, Why do not we find it in any ancient

ent Creed? Why must we not say [I believe in the Pope of *Rome*] as well as [I believe in God?] Or if indeed it be the Pope and *Romanists* that is meant by [the holy Catholike Church] why would not the composers of the Creed tell us so? And why did none of the ancient Churches understand and expound it so? And why did no age add the word [*Romane*] and call it [the holy *Romane* Catholike Church.]

2. And then withal, besides the present Schisme which they have made, they have laid the ground of a perpetual schisme. For they have made a new definition of the Catholicke Church, and made it another thing then it was before, and they have made a new head and center of its unity; so that all the old sort of Christians to the end of the world, that cannot change their Church and unite to the new head and center, must needs be of a different body from the *Romanists*. And if these men say that it is the rest of the Christian world that first withdraws from them. 1. Let them prove that the *Greek*, *Abassins* & the rest of the Christian world that deny subjection to them, except these in the West, were ever under them. 2. And as for the Reformed Churches if they were drawn in heretofore (I mean their forefathers) to countenance the *Romish* usurpation & tyranny, they withdraw only from that usurpation, & separate from *Rome* only as it is a faction & not as from a Church. If we be drawn into a schism & separation from all the Christian world, by the fraud of *Rome*, is it unlawful for us to repent & return to the unity of the Catholike Church, and to renounce the Schism that we were guilty of? This is our great sin? we are schismatics because we will not continue schismatics? we are Schismatics by casting off the Schism of *Rome*, because we will not be Schismatics by continuing to separate from all the Churches else on earth.

3. But

3. But let us come to the tryal with them who laid the first Schismatical Principle? Was it not they that first defined the Catholike Church as equipollent with the *Romane*? and first made the universal Headship of their Pope to be the center? Did ever *Peter* or *Paul* or any Apostle do so? Did they give us such a definition of the Catholike Church? Or did the Church do so for many a hundred year after them? Prove this well, and take all; and we promise to turn Papists without delay. The plaine truth is this. The Catholike Church for many hundred years after Christ was that Body of Christians who were united or centred only in Christ the head, and held communion in the fundamentals or great and necessary points of faith and worship: and had no mortal head or Center: But the worldly greatness of the City of *Rome*, occasioneth the inflation and proud usurpation of her Bishop, and he will needs make himself the Center of union and universal head, when there was no Center or head, but Christ before: And is not this the vilest Schisme that men can tell how to be guilty of? suppose that the King of *Spaine* having his Dominions remote one part from another, some in Europe; and some in the *Indies*, that for five or six hundred years the *Indies* should acknowledge no other head but the King of *Spaine*, and the Governors of each Province should receive their severall Commissions immediately from him, and stand in no regimental subordination to one another, but onely be bound by the King to have communion and hold correspondence for their mutual safety and the common good: If now after so long time the Vice King of *Mexico*, shall by Degrees make himself the sovereign of the rest,

first

first claiming onely the first place in their Assemblies, because he is Governor of the greatest City; and then requiring them to do nothing without him, or his consent, and at last proclaiming himself the head of the *Indies* under the King of *Spaine*, and that none are subjects to the King but those that profess themselves also subjects to him, but all the rest are rebels and traytors, and to be used accordingly; exhorting and commanding all to fall upon them and use them as such: And all this upon pretence that *Spain* is so far off, that the King there is invisible and inaccessible to them in the *Indies*, and therefore the King hath given him a Commission to be his substitute, as being more visible and accessible. If now the rest of the Presidents, Governors and Provinces, shall refuse to acknowledge the Headship of this man, and shall declare that they dare center to no head, but the King of *Spaine* without his express Commission manifested, and the Provinces of *Mexico* and the adjacent parts onely shall be otherwise minded and subject themselves to the usurper, who is it that causeth the Schisme in the King of *Spains* dominions? And which partie is it that holdeth to the ancient terms of unity? and which are the dividers? I need not stand to make a particular application: It is even so, between us and the Pope with his Romanists. The Church of old was centred onely in Christ and headed onely by him: At last the Pope pretending Christs distance and invisibility, and a Commission that he hath from Christ to be his Vicar General (written in letters that none can read but himself and his party) will needs become the visible head and center: and whereas before those onely were the rebels that rejected Christ, now all must be rebels

bels that are not subject to the Popes.

And to aggravate the crime by the addition of hypocrisie, all this Schisme and separation must be carryed on by a pretence of unity: They make the poor simple people believe that the Pope being the Head and center, there is no unity to be held but in him, and that we must all be guilty of Schisme that unite not in him, and that all our divisions are caused by our departing from this center of unity: when it is himself that hath divided from the rest of the Christian world, and would drown the infamy of it by accusing others of the same sin that he is so notoriously guilty of. By which we may well see, that accusing others is none of the surest signs of innocency, but too common a trick to divert the suspicion from themselves. When the Papists that are the greatest Schismatics on earth, do make such an outcry against us as Schismatics, because we have repented of our joyning with them in their Schisme, and will not confederate with them in evil, against the Laws of Christ, and the necessary means of the unity of his Church.

Arg. 7. If the faith of Papists as Papists, which is that we call Popery, be a meerly uncertain, changeable thing, so that a man can never tell when he hath it all then is it no safe way to Salvation. But the faith of Papists (as such) is such a meerly uncertain changeable thing: Therefore it is no safe way to Salvation.

The consequence of the Major, I suppose they will grant. For how can that be a safe way, 1. which is uncertain, 2. and changeable; when the true way

to salvation is one and the same, and changeth not since Christ had established and sealed his Laws.

All the question therefore is of the Minor: which I prove, 1. From the Popish principles, 2. From their Practices, both which do plainly shew that their new Religion is a meer Weather-cock that must sit with the winde of the mutable conceits of the Pope and his Clergy. Even like the Religion of the Enthusiasts that wait still for new Revelations to be super-added to the Scripture.

And first for their principles, one is that [The Scripture is not the whole word of God, or sufficient rule of faith or manners, but onely a part of the Word and Rule, and that unwritten Traditions are the other part: Yea *Rushworths Dialogues*, *Bellarmino*, and the rest of them ordinarily, tell us that Scripture was not chiefly given to be a Rule of faith at all: saith *Bellarmin. de verbo dei li. 4. cap. 12.* [*Finis Scripturæ præcipuus non est, ut sit Regula fidei, sed ut variis documentis, exemplis, adhortationibus, nunc terrendo, nunc instruendo, nunc minando, nunc consolando adjuvet nos in hac peregrinatione.*] that is [The chief end of Scripture, is not to be a Rule of faith: but that by divers documents, examples, adhortations, sometime by affrighting, sometime by instructing, sometime by threatening, sometime by comforting, it may help us in this our peregrination.] It is then unwritten Traditions that are part of Gods Word, and at least part of the Rule of faith: And where these Traditions are to be found, and what they are, and how many, and by what notes they may all be known, either they dare not tell us, for fear of bringing mens faith to a certainty, from un-

der the lock and key of the Pope, or else in telling us they do but cloud the business with general terms, or else disagree among themselves. That the Scripture it self is delivered to us infallibly, we doubt not: and thereby we know the Canonical books: But this may be done without another word of God: The act of Delivery from the Apostles is not a new Revelation or Word of God, but the natural means of conveying the word to those for whom it was intended: And the *object* of that Act of *Delivery* was not another Word of God, but all and onely these same Canonical Books: so that I know which is the Canon (among other reasons) because I can prove (not by another Word of God, but) by infallible humane Testimony (such as I have of the Laws of this Land) that the Bible, and these particular books in it were actually delivered by the holy Writers to the Churches. If God write the two Tables of stone, and therein make known that they are his Laws, and then Deliver these to *Moses*, this *Delivering* is not a new Word of God, but a necessary act for the promulgation of the Word: So that if you aske an Israelite how he knows, whether onely the ten Commandments and all those ten were contained in the Tables? He can prove it to you by the Tables Delivered, and by proving the Act of *Delivery*, though he could bring no other word of God which told you what was in those Tables. And indeed, if these must needs be another Word of God, besides the Delivering Acts to prove the former to be the Word of God, and tell us its parts, then there must also be another word to discover that second Word to be the Word of God, and another to discover that, and so in *infinitum*.

Our acknowledged necessary Tradition, therefore, is not another *materia tradita*, or Word of God, but onely one of the *actus tradendi*, and act of delivering the same matter or word.

But for the Papists that will have another part of the Rule of Divine faith, they will never be able to tell us what it is, and where, and to let us understand when we have all. *Bellarmino de verba dei non Scripto li. 4. cap. 9.* layes down five Rules by which we may know the true Traditions. The first is [When the whole Church embraceth anything as a point of faith, which is not found in the Scriptures of God, we must needs say, that this was had from the tradition of the Apostles.] The second is [When the universal Church keepeth somewhat which none could constitute but God, and which is not found written, we must needs say, that this was delivered from Christ and the Apostles.] The third is [That which is kept in the universal Church, and through all times past, is deservedly judged to have been instituted by the Apostles, though it be such a thing as the Church might institute.] The fourth is [When all the Doctors of the Church do with one consent teach that such a thing descended by Apostolical Tradition, either Congregate in a General Council, or writing it apart in books, this is to be believed to be an Apostolike Tradition.] The fifth Rule is this [That is without doubts to be believed to descend from Apostolical Tradition, which is held for such in those Churches where the succession from the Apostles is entire and continued.] These are *Bellarmines* five Rules.

But 1. What the particular Apostolical Traditions are which are Gods Word according to these Rules, he had more wit, or less honesty then to let us under-

der the lock and key of the Pope, or else in telling us they do but cloud the business with general terms, or else disagree among themselves. That the Scripture it self is delivered to us infallibly, we doubt not: and thereby we know the Canonical books: But this may be done without another word of God: The act of Delivery from the Apostles is not a new Revelation or Word of God, but the natural means of conveying the word to those for whom it was intended: And the *object* of that Act of *Delivery* was not another Word of God, but all and onely these same Canonical Books: so that I know which is the Canon (among other reasons) because I can prove (not by another Word of God, but) by infallible humane Testimony (such as I have of the Laws of this Land) that the Bible, and these particular books in it were actually delivered by the holy Writers to the Churches. If God write the two Tables of stone, and therein make known that they are his Laws, and then Deliver these to *Moses*, this *Delivering* is not a new Word of God, but a necessary act for the promulgation of the Word: So that if you aske an Israelite how he knows, whether onely the ten Commandments and all those ten were contained in the Tables? He can prove it to you by the Tables Delivered, and by proving the Act of *Delivery*, though he could bring no other word of God which told you what was in those Tables. And indeed, if these must needs be another Word of God, besides the Delivering Acts to prove the former to be the Word of God, and tell us in parts, then there must also be another word to discover that second Word to be the Word of God, and another to discover that, and so in *infinitum*.

Our acknowledged necessary Tradition, therefore is not another *materia tradita*, or Word of God, but onely one of the *actus tradendi*, and act of delivering the same matter or word.

But for the Papists that will have another part of the Rule of Divine faith, they will never be able to tell us what it is, and where, and to let us understand when we have all. *Bellarmino de verba dei non Scripto* li. 4. cap. 9. layes down five Rules by which we may know the true Traditions. The first is [When the whole Church embraceth anything as a point of faith, which is not found in the Scriptures of God, we must needs say, that this was had from the tradition of the Apostles.] The second is [When the universal Church keepeth somewhat which none could constitute but God, and which is not found written, we must needs say, that this was delivered from Christ and the Apostles.] The third is [That which is kept in the universal Church, and through all times past, is deservedly judged to have been instituted by the Apostles, though it be such a thing as the Church might institute.] The fourth is [When all the Doctors of the Church do with one consent teach that such a thing descended by Apostolical Tradition, either Congregate in a General Council, or writing it apart in books, this is to be believed to be an Apostolike Tradition.] The fifth Rule is this [That is without doubt to be believed to descend from Apostolical Tradition, which is held for such in those Churches where the succession from the Apostles is entire and continued.] These are *Bellarmino's* five Rules.

But 1. What the particular Apostolical Traditions are which are Gods Word according to these Rules, he had more wit, or less honesty then to let us under-

derstand. Is it because the word of God is indeed yet unknown? or cannot be known? or because it is not fit to make it known? or because the Pope must pretend to the keeping of these hidden Laws, that so the world may receive them at his mouth?

2. And I would fain know whether these Rules of *Bellarmines* to know the unwritten word by, are themselves the Word of God, or not? If they be, are they written or unwritten, and how known to be so? If not, then it seems we may have Rules and means which are not the word of God, by which we may infallibly know which is the true word of God? And then there needs no unwritten word to deliver or prove the written word.

3. And why may not another Doctor by these Rules, know the unwritten word, as well as the Pope, and another Church as well as the *Romane*?

4. And why may not the Christian people through the world procure from some one charitable Pope, through so many hundred years, a Catalogue of those unwritten verities, that the word of God may be once commonly known, and men may know when they have all, without uncertain dependencies on the Pope, or travailing in vain to *Rome* to know.

5. And for those few that *Bellarmino* hath instanced in, *viz.* The perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*, The Baptisme of Infants, the validity of Hereticks Baptism, the fast of Lent, the inferior orders of the Clergy, the veneration of Images. To the first, I say, It is no Article of Divine Faith, but of humane Ecclesiastical: The second is proved fully out of Scripture: And so is the third, if you take it of
such

such Hereticks (in a larger sence) as expressly exclude nothing essential to baptism, but expressly include it all: But for the rest, *Bellarmino* should remember how elsewhere he defendeth the Council that required the rebaptizing of those that were baptized by the Paulinists, because they were Anti-trinitarians. For Lent, I say, no more can be proved of it, but onely that it is an ancient Ecclesiastical constitution. And the inferior orders are apparently novelties, introduced after the first age, if not the second too, and not mentioned in any of the first writers, but the sum of Church Officers enumerated without them. Much more novel is the unlawful use of Images in Churches or as immediate instruments to excite devotion in prayer, and for other lawful use, we deny it not.

6. But principally I would intreat *Bellarmino* and the Pope that hereafter they would obtrude no unwritten word upon us, but what is proved to be such, at least by his own Rules. Let us have some proof that it proceedeth from the universal Church, and not their naked word without evidences. And then we must intreat them to be so honest, as not to unchurch the *Greeks*, *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Protestants*, and all the Christians in the world except *Romanists*, that so they may be the whole Catholike Church, and then prove any thing to be the word of God by their own Testimony alone. Nor yet to perswade us that such a Council as theirs at *Trent* contained the whole Catholike Church real or representative; nor yet to bring us two or three Fathers, and say that those were all the Doctors of the Church.

More particularly I answer to his Rules in order. To the first I say. 1. That prove if you can that ever the whole Church embraced any thing as a point of Divine faith which is not contained in the Written Word. 2. If the whole Church embrace it, then it is no secret, and therefore we all may know it, yea and actually do know it as well as the Pope.

To the second Rule I say, You may prove a mistaken observance of rites by the greater part of the Church, but prove that the *whole* Church kept any thing unwritten, which none could constitute but God: But if they did, still it must needs be known to all, and therefore not controvertible, or lockt up in the Popes closet. Prove also that the universal Church may not erre in some lesser matters about Christs supposed constitutions.

To the third I say, If by [*all times past*] you include the Apostles, then we grant your Rule: but meer Ecclesiastical Canons may be observed through all times shortly after the Apostles, and yet not as Apostolical, but Ecclesiastical: Yet when you come to try your Traditions by this Rule, I am not out of doubt that you will but disgrace them, and fail your Readers just expectations.

To the fourth I say, 1. I will believe you, if you speak of all the Doctors of the Church next to the Apostles, or so neer as that the danger of mistaking was not great. 2. But I do not believe that you will find any of your Traditions asserted to be Gods Word, by all the Doctors of the Church (nor neer all) in any one age: unless you make your faction to be all.

The last Rule is but a meer trick of wit to get the
key

key into the Popes hand alone : To which I say, 1. A Church that hath had an interrupted succession of true Pastors from the Apostles, may fall into many errors in process of time, which in *Tertullians* and *Irenaus* dayes, when the memory of all the Apostles practices were so fresh, they could not fall into so easily. 2. Those Churches have received their unwritten verities, either by writings from their predecessors or without : If by writings, why cannot others find it there as well as they ? If without, it must be an uncertain, and mutable means ; or by a means so publike still that all as well as they may know of it. 3. And we undertake to prove that the succession of true Pastors of the *Romish* See hath been long ago, and often interrupted. And therefore this Rule will not serve your turns.

But though I have been long upon this principle of the Papists to prove the uncertainty of their faith, yet the next is the chief that I intended, which also proveth the mutability of it.

2. The Papists ordinarily hold that *as to us*, that is Gods Word which the Pope with his Clergy say is Gods Word ; and that his determination or Declaration that this or that is a point of faith, doth make it *to us* a point of faith, and necessary to be believed to salvation, which before was not so ; So that according to the Papists, the Churches faith must alter at the Popes pleasure (at least with his Clergy) And by new declarations and determinations, he may make them a new Article of their Creed, when he will : so that their faith is as mutable and fallible as their Pope ; and this they are themselves aware of : and therefore feign him to be infallible that they may prove their faith infallible : which if they could do

(as they never can) yet still their faith is mutable by their own confession, if not by revocations, yet by new additions *as to us*: so that their Religion is in continual progress or flux, and groweth in quantity as every Pope doth adde his Determinations. Now I would know of any Papist in the world, or of the Pope himself if he would condescend to such considerations, whether they are sure that yet they have all that is made necessary to be believed to salvation, upon supposal of their determination? How can they tell but that their successors may make the Creed as long again as it is, and make their Religion another thing? I know they will say, that *as to them* no more is *de fide* then the Pope determineth to be so.

But then, 1. If he would not determine it, no man should be bound to believe in Christ, and so none be damned for unbelief.

2. If it be a benefit to have all points of faith determined, Why are they not done, but one Pope must adde one, and another adde another to the end of the world (if Christ should let them go on.)

3. Sure the preaching of any one Apostle or other Preacher of the Gospel in the first age did leave the unbelievers without excuse; and not onely the Cathedral Determination of Saint Peter. And why then doth not any Preachers Revelation of Gods will from his Word, oblige men now to believe as well as it did then?

And 3. It is evident and undeniable that their practice is according to their principles. The Popish Religion changeth so fast by the new additions

tions of several Popes, that it is not the same thing now, as it was heretofore. Look but into the Oath, or *Trent* Confession which I recited in the beginning, and you may presently see how their Religion is swelled bigger then it was. All the Popes Decretals, or at least all the Canons of *Trent*, and every General Council (at least, confirmed by the Pope) do enlarge their faith, as they adde any thing to what went before. What a multitude of things are *de fide* now, that were not so within a thousand years? What man can give up himself to such a growing Religion, where we must waite on the Pope, as the Enthusiasts do on God, for new Additional Revelations? And cannot know when we have all or halfe. How can they tell but their Creed may fill more volumes yet before that all their Popes have done with it?

Nay further note, that the Pope can make not onely new wayes to Heaven, but several wayes to Heaven at once. He could once dispence with the *Bohemians* for receiving in both kinds, and yet make it necessary to the salvation of others, to take it but in one, because he so decreed it to be given. So that there shall be one Creed in one part of the world, and another in the rest.

It is a damnable Heresie in parts that are absolutely under his power, for the vulgar to read the Scripture in their own Tongue. But in *England*, he can make it Lawfull, lest it hinder his designs, though his Doctors have long determined that it is the Mother of all Heresies.

So

So that Popery is not the same thing in one Country as it is in another; nor the same thing at *Rome* it self in one age as it is at another.

To give you a fresh example: How long have the Dominicans and Jesuites, the Jansenists, and the Molinists been in contention about Predestination, Freewill, Predetermination, Universal Redemption, &c. and one party condemned the other, professing their opinions to be heretical, and destructive to the Catholike faith? as is to be seen in the writings between *Petavius*, *Ricardus*, and *Vincentius Lenu*, alias *Fromondus*, with many more before them: But when they speak to us about these matters they persuade us that it is onely about certain Shool points that they differ, and not about any points of faith: For they are not points of faith to us till the Pope have determined them. And while the eager contenders on either side endeavor to have the Pope determine the controversie on their side, no Pope durst do it for fear of losing the reputation of his infallibility with the adverse party; and so the unmerciful Popes have long suffered their Doctors to live in contention, and to write voluminously against one another, and their *Romane* Church to be broken into parties, because they would not once open their mouths to decide the difference. But now at last it pleased Pope *Innocent* the tenth (though he durst not touch the principal points) to favor his Jesuites so far as to determine five of the controverted points for the Molinists against the Jansenians (when Pope *Clement* was once about determining all for the Dominicans as they thought) Mark here the agreement of the Papists, and the stability of their faith. Before the determination each party main-
tain-

rained their way as *de fide*, and accused the other as
 Heretical: some boldly prognosticated (as our
Thomas Anglus alias *White*) that the Pope would
 never determine the controversie about Predetermi-
 nation. And now the Pope hath tryed the stomachs
 of his Dominicans with the Determination of these
 five Articles. First, to see how they will digest them
 before he went further: And he pronounceth them
 to be Heretical, and some of them temerarious, im-
 pious, and blasphemous too, condemning them
 with *Anathema*: Now those become points of faith
 on one side, and Heresies on the other which were
 none before. Till this Determination the Church of
 Rome wanted five Articles of their Creed, or had
 five fewer then now they have: A man might have
 been saved before, that had believed, that [*Liberty*
from necessity is not necessary to Merit] with the rest
 of them, but now all of that belief must be damned.
 And was not the Pope unmerciful to the poor Do-
 minicans, to send them all to Hell, that cannot
 change their belief, knowing how hard it is for a
 learned Tribe, especially so countenanced by *Aug-*
ustine, and *Thomas*, to alter their mindes unfeigned-
 ly at a word. And yet in the *Trent* Confession they
 must all solemnly swear and vow that all things deli-
 vered, defined, and declared, by the sacred Canons
 and Oecumenical Councils, especially that of *Trent*,
 they do *without doubting* receive and profess: though
 no man had ever heard the Popes Reasons, yet if he
 do but see the Determination of their Church, he
 must presently not onely believe the contrary to
 what he believed before, but do it also *without*
doubting; though they'l confess millions are saved
 that believe Christ to be the Son of God, though
 not

not without doubting. Well : but see what unity is procured by the addition of these new Articles to their Creed? The *French Doctors* ascribe to his holiness that the said Articles may be taken in several senses : The one sense is Heretical, *Lutheran* or *Calvinian*, but that is a sense, *That the words lawfully used will not bear, but onely may malignantly be fastened to them* (say they) The other sense (which is genuine and proper) they *Defend themselves*, as true, and as pertaining to the Belief of the Church, as the *Doctrine of Augustine*, and as defined by the *Council of Trent*, and the contrary Opinion of *Molina* and the adversaries others maintain to be Pelagian or Semipelagian. See here what the Papists themselves now do implicitly charge upon the Pope; That he (by his express unlimited condemnation) doth malignantly fasten an Heretical sense on the words, which properly they will not bear, or else that he contradicteth *Augustine* and the *Council of Trent*, and Anathematizeth the Christian faith, and maintaineth the Semipelagian Heresie of *Molina*. And yet must we judge either their Pope to be infallible; or their Church to be at such unity in faith as they would make the ignorant vulgar believe? More of the like contention about his holiness Determinations you may see in *Tho. Whites Appendicula ad sonum Buccina*, and *Franciscus Macedo* his *Lituum Lusitanum* : In all which you may see that all the comfort that the poor Dominicans have left them (even their hope of salvation if they be Papists indeed) consisteth in this, that the Pope speaks one thing and means another, and that (as *White* so merrily saith, in so sad a matter) *The wise father of the Church was necessitated for the appeasing of contentions, to*

grant the more turbulent party their words, and the more obedient party their sense: so that when the Pope hath done all that he can to determine their controversies, they will still say, that he determineth but the words (nay he doth but grant one party their words) and not the meaning: and so not onely sense, but bare terms must be made Articles of faith.

And here you may see the great force of the Papists arguing for a necessity of a living Judge to determine of the sense of Scripture, because the Scripture is so ambiguous that each one will else wrest it, his own way: And do we not see, that the Pope cannot, after so many years deliberation, determine five short Articles so expressly and plainly, even when he doth it of purpose to decide the controversy, as to make his learned Doctors understand him? but that each party doth take his words to be either for, or not against their opinions, and hold their opinions as fast since his determination as before: And so they do by *Augustine*, *Thomas* and the Council of *Trent*: each party confidently perswading the world that they were of their side. And may not God have the honor of speaking as plainly as the Pope or *Thomas* or the Council of *Trent*? and cannot we well be without the Decision of such a Judge, as cannot speak so as to be understood by his greatest Doctors himself.

So that the Principles and Practices of the Romanists do assure us that their faith is unfixed, growing and mutable; they may be one year of one Religion, and another year of another, as please the Pope: A Dominican might have been saved at any time since the creation till *May 31. 1653.* when the Popes
Deter

Determination was dated : but now they must all be damned for heresie. There is a new way to heaven made 1653. that never was before : and for ought they know to the contrary before their Popes have done Determining, there may be five hundred Articles more in their Creed. So that for my part I desire not either to be shut out of heaven at the pleasure of every new Pope, nor to be of so uncertain and changeable a Religion : And I cannot think therefore that Popery is a safe way to salvation.

Arg. 8. That Doctrine which derogateth from the written Word of God, and setteth the Decrees of men above it, enabling them to contradict its most express institutions, is no safe way to salvation : But such is the Doctrine of Popery : therefore it is no safe way to salvation

The Major is unquestionably true among true Christians. For the proof of the Minor I shall only give you three instances of the Popish Doctrine, because I intend not to be too particular, lest I be too large.

The first is, their affirming the Scripture both to be insufficient to discover the whole doctrine of faith, as being but one part of Gods Word, and Tradition the other part, and also to be no Word of God at all to us, till the Pope and his Clergy do authoritatively determine it so to be; or that we cannot know the Scripture to be Gods word, but upon the Authority of the Churches determination. But of this I have spoken before, and shall do more in another dispute.

The second instance that I give is, Their changing Christs most expresse institution, by withholding the Cup in the Lords Supper from the people, and giving them but half the Sacrament. I am not now disputing about the efficacy or inefficacy of one half, so delivered; but proving the intolerable Arrogancy of the Papists that dare set up the will of man above Gods Word, and give power to the Pope to change Christs Institutions; and not onely to adde but to diminish, and expressly to contradict Christ, and forbid what he commandeth. I know they pretend that it was but to the twelve Apostles that Christ gave the Cup, and not to the Laity: True, nor the bread neither: but then if he intended that none but the Clergy have the Cup, why may they not as well say so of the Bread? But do not these deceivers know? 1. That Christ gives this reason of his administering the Cup [*Drink ye All of it: For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the Remission of sins?*] So that if this reason hold to others, if his blood be shed for the sins of others as well as for the Clergie, then the command extendeth to others [*Drink ye all of it.*] And do they not know that *Luke* further intimateth this in his narration of the words of Christ [*This Cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you?*] So that those whom it is shed for (and we may discern to be Believers) it may be applyed to. 2. And do they not know that *Paul* delivereth the doctrine both of the Bread and Cup, as from the Lord, to the whole Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 11. and not onely to the Clergy? Is it not all that he expressly commandeth to [*Examine themselves, and so to eat of this Bread and Drink of this Cup?*] Alas, they know

know all this: they cannot but know it, and yet they will contradict the exprefs word of God: God saith [*Drink ye all of it*] and [*Let a man examine himself, and so drink:*] The Pope saith, Let none of the people drink of it, but the Clergy only. What is this but to abrogate Gods Laws, and set up the Popes above and against it? Yea unless it were to shew the world their Power to contradict Christ and destroy his word, who can imagine what should move them to this attempt? If there were any temptation of profit or honor in the business (as there is in the maintaing of the Popes supremacy, Purgatory, Indulgences, Pardons, &c.) we should not wonder at it: But what profit, or honor, or pleasure is it, thus to contradict Christ? and for them that adde such a multitude of their own Ceremonies, to affect so to cut off one half of the Sacramental Rite and matter which Christ ordained.

Nay thirdly, Do not these men know that the Bread and Cup were both given to the people by the Primitive Church? and that it so continued for many hundred years? and that their alteration is a meer novelty. Yes, they know all this: For the matter is so far past doubt that they cannot but know it. And yet these deceivers would make the people believe that they are of the old Religion, and our Religion is new. These are they that cry out against our casting off Apostolical Traditions, and the Churches constitutions and customs, and going in new wayes which our forefathers knew not: These are they that make it a mark of an Apostolical Tradition, that the *whole Church* hath received it, and that as from the Apostles. And yet these men dare cast off,

not

not onely that which they know the whole primitive Church received and practised as from the Apostles (as *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and all antiquity profess) but also is expressly contained in the Scripture. With what face can these that exclaim against novelty, introduce such a palpable novelty into the Church? with what face can they that so cry up antiquity, gainsay all antiquity? and they that cry up *the whole Churches consent*, so go against the consent of the whole Church for so many Ages after the Apostles? They dare not deny but this part of Popery is utterly *New*, against the constant practice and Canons of all Churches.

The third point which I shall instance in, is, Their performing Gods publike service in Latine, and forbidding the people to read the Scriptures in their known vulgar Tongue; when as the Apostle *Paul* hath written the greatest part of a whole Chapter, *1 Cor. 14.* expressly against this opinion and practice, and for using of a known tongue that others may understand and be edified. The evasions by which they would elude that part of Scripture; are so senseless that I think it not necessary to recite them: but rather suppose that they need no other confutation than the bare considerate reading of the Text; and therefore I shall venture the Reader (if he have common capacity and impartiality, and be but willing to know the truth) upon any thing that the Papists shall be able to say, for their Latine Service, and locking up the Scriptures, so be it he will but read that Chapter considerately. And are not these good Teachers in Christs School that will lock up the Grammar from their Schollars, when it is

L the

the very office of the Presbyters to teach it the people? And to hide from them that word of the living God, which he hath given the world to be their Directory to salvation? The Prophets, and Christ and the Apostles did speak and write this word in a known tongue to the people to whom they did immediately direct it: And must All hear and read it then, and onely the Learned now? Are not these the men that take away the Key of knowledge, and will neither enter in themselves, nor suffer others to enter? They do expressly contradict the Commands of God, and bid the people not read the Scripture, when God hath charged them to write it on the very posts of their houses, and on their doors, and that it be as a frontlet between their eyes, and that they teach it their children, speaking of it lying down and rising up, at home and abroad, *Deut. 6 & 11.* God makes it the mark of the Blessed man, *Psal. 1. 2, 3.* To meditate day and night in his Law, as making it his delight: and the Papists commonly maintain in their writings that to have the Scripture in the vulgar tongue is the root of all heresies. God maketh the study of his word the duty and mark of all his Disciples, and the Papists make it the mark of a Heretick, and have burned many a one for it here in Queen *Maries* dayes, and tormented and burnt many by their bloody inquisition for it abroad. The very Pharisees thought that their vulgar were cursed that knew not the Law, and the Papists will not let it be made known to them lest it make them accursed. God saith [*To the Law and to the Testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them, Isa. 8. 20.*] The Papists cry out precht--- hinc away: let it alone, meddle not with

it, it will make you Hereticks : And indeed they have had large experience that the way which they call heresie, and contradicteth their impieties, is most effectually promoted by the word of God : and therefore they think they have some reason to speak against it. Saint John saith [*These things are written that ye might believe; and that believing yee might have life through his name*] Joh. 20. 31. The Papists say, Read not these holy writings, lest they destroy your faith, and bring you to damnation. When the man Luk. 10. 26, asketh Christ [*What shall I do to inherit eternal life?*] Christ answereth him thus [*What is written in the Law? how readest thou?*] directing to the course which the Papists do forbid. The Apostle saith, that [*Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our Learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scripture might have hope*] Rom. 15. 4. But the Papists will not have men learn that, which was written for their Learning, Comfort and Hope. John wrote to fathers, young men, and children, 1 John 2. 12, 13, 14. Gods anger against the Jews was that [*He had written to them the great or wonderful things of his Law, and they had accounted them as strange things*] Hos. 8. 12. And the Papists will force people to be strange to these writings. Yet how familiar (comparatively) they were to the vulgar Jews and their very children known and acknowledged. Is it not a high advancement of the Gospel Church, above the legal Jewish Church, which the Papists do vouchsafe it? That we may not have the same liberty or means of knowledge as the very children of the Jews had? Their children must be taught the Scripture, lying down and rising up, and our eldest people even to

the leſt breath muſt not read them, unleſs they can learn the tongues which they were firſt written in. The Jewes had the Septuagints Translation (or that ſo called) when the Hebrew grew ſtrange to them, which the Apoſtles uſed in their ordinary citations; and they heard the Goſpel preached in the Syriack, which was then their vulgar tongue: But we may not read the ſame in our Vulgar tongue by the Papiſts conſent, *Mofes, Joſhua, Joſiab, Nehemiah*, Read the Scriptures to all the people, *Exod* 24. 7. *Joſh.* 8. 34, 35. *2 King.* 23. 1, 2, 3. *Neh.* 8. 3. 8. 18. & 9. 3 & 13. 1. And it was their cuſtome to read *Mofes* and the Prophets to the people every Sabbath day, *Act.* 13. 27. & 15. 21. *2 Cor.* 3. 15. *Luk* 4. 16. And Chriſt uſeth to reprehend their ſtrangenels to Scripture paſſages, as if they had not read them with ſuch words as theſe [*Have ye not read, &c?*] and [*Have ye never read, &c?*] *Mat* 12. 3. 5. & 19. 4. & 21. 26. & 22. 21. *Mark* 12. 10. 26. *Luk* 6. 3. *Luk* 10. 26. And *Mofes* commandeth *Israel*, the Priests, Levites and all the Elders thus, *Deut.* 31. 11, 12, 13. [*When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he ſhall chooſe, thou ſhalt read this Law before all Israel in their hearing; Gather the people together, men and women and children, and the ſtranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and obſerve to do all the words of this Law; and that their children which have not known any thing may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the Land &c.*] It was therefore in a known tongue that it muſt be read; And when the people underſtood not the old Hebrew tongue in which the Law was written, by reaſon of the change of their ſpeech

in the captivity, *Nebemiah* caused them to understand the Reading, *Neh. 8. 8.* No doubt, by expressing it in the language which they understood. And yet the Papists forbid the unlearned, that have most need of teachings, the use of the holy Scriptures in a known tongue, and make it the mother of all Heresies. How impiously against God, and how cruelly against men, is this committed? Must the God of heaven send down his Spirit to dictate an illuminating Doctrine to his Prophets and Apostles for the world? must he give them a perfect Law, by which Truth and Heresie must be discerned? Must he send his own Son to preach the Gospel? and cause his instruments to write it, in a language best known to those that they conversed with, or to the world that was to be converted by it? And must this Doctrine now be made the mother of Heresies, and kept from the eyes of the people that should learn it? What, must the only rule that condemneth Heresies, be made the cause of them? Must the light which God hath given the world, be blamed for all the Darkness of mens errors? Or must men be kept from the light, for fear lest it lead them into Darkness? This is the Popish Piety and Charity: In stead of helping to Illuminate the dark world, as all preachers of the Gospel should do (*Act. 26. 17, 18.*) they must have all the unlearned to put out their eyes, and be led by their guides, and trust their souls with them, for fear lest if they have any eyes in their heads, and any light to walk by, they should stumble or erre through the imperfection of their sight.

And yet the Papists, who so much pretend to unity, are various and changeable in this high point of their abomination, as well as in other things. For when they once see that they cannot keep the Scriptures from the people, because the Protestants Translations are among them; then they will permit them to read their own Translations: And upon this account the Rhemists translated the New Testament into *English*, when they saw they could not wholly suppress and hide that light: And on this account it is that our Papists in *England*, and some other parts where the Protestants abound among them, are permitted by their Priests (with some warnings of the needlessness, and the danger of it) to read the Scripture in their Country tongue: When as to a Papist in *Spain* or *Italy* it is no less a crime then to merit the Rack or Strappado of the Inquisition, and its strange if they be not burnt for it at a stake. So that I have met with some seduced Papists in *England*, so ignorant of their course abroad, and so gulled by the lies of their companions or Priests, that they would not believe that they do any where forbid the vulgar to read the Scripture in their own tongue; but were confidently perswaded that it was our slander of them: so that these poor people believe that the Sun is not set in *Spain* at midnight, because it shines at noon in *England*. Let them read but *Job. Arboreus Theosoph. l. 8. c. 9. Andradius Defens. Concil. Trident. l. 4. Petrus Lizetus Dialog. de sacris libris in vulg. Eloq. non evertendis. Hosius Dialog. de Communion. &c. Petrus sutor de Translatione Biblie: Bellarm. de verbo Dei l. 2. c. 15. & 16. Salmeron. in 1 Cor. Disp. 30. Bellarmine himself mentioneth the Index librorum prohibitis. of Pope Pius 4. Reg. 4. which*

which forbiddeth the reading of the Scripture, in the vulgar tongue, except only to those that the ordinary shall think will receive good and not harm by it, and so shall have a licence from him in writing, and they pronounce that the common permission of the Scriptures thus doth more harm then good: The same Index was after encreased and approved by Pope Sixtus 5. and Clemens 8. And how few they are that their Ordinaries will grant Licences to, for the reading of Scripture, is too well known by common experience. The Kings of Spaine forbid all Translations of the Bible into the vulgar tongues; and Alphonsus a Castro commendeth them for it: and many a one hath been burnt to ashes for selling, keeping, or reading such Bibles, in Spaine, Italy, and Savoy. And Bellarmine mentioneth the *Sess. 22. cap. 8* and *Can. 9.* of the Council of Trent forbidding both the Common reading of such Bibles, and also the publike use of them in the Churches, in both which we must have them onely in Hebrew, Greek, and Latine. Bellarm. *ubi supra*. If these be not notorious enemies of the Light, who are? David saith, *Psal. 119.* That the word was a Lanterne to his feet, and a Light to his Paths. *Isaiah* sends us to the Law and to the testimony, saying that if they speak not according to these it is because there is no light in them, *Isa. 8. 20.* And the Phipists say (as *Arboreus ubi supra*) that the reading the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue is the Rise or Root of all Heresies: And so the Sun must be taken out of the firmament as being the fountain of all darkness, or at least the cause of mens wandrings. Onely where they cannot help it (or as *Stapleton* saith, where Heresies are most common) there they will permit or connive at

it, for their own ends. For Necessary hath no Law.

I conclude therefore, and confidently conclude, that *Popery is not a safe way to heaven*, because it doth 1. both vilifie Gods Scriptures as an insufficient Rule, and but part of his word: And 2. presumeth to alter its most expresse institutions (as the Cup in the Lords Supper) And 3. expressly contradict it, in forbidding the Prayers of the Church to be in a known tongue. 4. And forbid the publike reading of Scripture in a known tongue. 5. And forbid the translating of Scripture, and the reading of such translations even by any private man, unless he have the Ordinaries Licence, which he may get in those Countreies where there is no remedy. The Kingdome of the Devil is called in Scripture the Kingdom of darkness; and Christs Kingdom is called, a Kingdom of light: and when ever God converteth a sinner, he translateth him from the Power of Darknes into his marvellous light, even into the Kingdom of his dear Son, *Act. 26. 18. Col. 1. 13. 1 Pet. 2. 9.* And God is the father of lights, *1 Jan. 1. 17.* And Satan is the Prince of the powers of darkness, *Luk 22 53. Rev 16. 10.* And Christ hath told us, that he that walketh in darkness stumbleth and knoweth not whither he goeth, *Joh. 12 35, 46.* And that every one that doth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light lest his deeds should be reprov'd; but he that doth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God, *Joh. 3. 21.* The Papists therefore give us reason to think they have not the truth, were it but in this enmity which they bear unto the Light.

Arg. 9. *That doctrine which teacheth men to worship the creature with Divine Worship, is no safe way to salvation. But Popery teacheth men to worship the creature with Divine Worship: Therefore it is no safe Way to salvation.*

The Major will not be denied by Papists: The Minor I prove by one instance onely (at this time:) and that is, their worshiping of the consecrated Host or Bread in their Mass, and at other times. He that worshipeth the consecrated Bread with Divine worship, doth worship the creature with Divine worship: But the Papists worship the consecrated Bread with Divine worship therefore. They deny the Major, and tell us, that it is no longer Bread but the Body of Christ: But that they worship that thing which we call *Bread*, and they call *Christs Body*, with Divine worship, they do not deny. Onely some would excuse them from the guilt of Idolatry (which is a worshiping the creature instead of the Creator) by this, because they think it is Christ that they worship, and so interpretatively it is he in deed and the worship right. But if they will think that to be Christ which is not Christ, and then worship it, that will not excuse them from being some kind of Idolaters: What if they will think a Ranter or Quaker to be Christ, who call themselves Christ? are they therefore excusable if they worship them? Then why might not the old Pagan Idolaters be justified, or thus excused, seeing they thought that the Sun and Moon had been Gods. And when they worshiped an Image, they thought that some Deity had affixed this

this special presence to that Image : What if an *Egyptian* thought that an Oxe was God , or that a Deity did dwell in him, were they therefore no Idolaters? And then, how hainously God taketh the sin of Idolatry, the Scripture fully witnesseth.

That which we have to do , therefore is onely to enquire whether indeed it be *bread* or Christs body, a creature or the Creator which they worship? Concerning which there is so much said by Doctor *Feastly* against *Fisher* , and by *Peter Martyr* against *Smith*, and elsewhere, and by *Jewel*, *Foxe*, and abundance more , that if people would read it, I should think it vain to say any more. I shall onely annex these Reasons (very briefly) which come first to my thoughts to prove that the Bread is not turned into the very body of Christ , but remaineth Bread still.

1. If the Bread were Christs real Body, then Christ had two real bodies : for he had one sitting at the table, which delivered the Bread , and if the Bread were another , he had two : or else the body that Christ sate and lived with , was not a whole body, but a part : But Christ had but one body , and that was entire.

2. It would follow also that Christ had a living and a dead body , a sensible and insensible body both at once.

3. It would follow that the Apostles did tear Christs true flesh , and draw out his blood as well as the Jews did.

4. Yea and that they began to the Jews , and did it before them : And therefore why should the Jews act, and theirs be so much differenced ?

5. It will follow that either Christ had one body torne

torne by the Jews, and another by the Disciples, or else that one part of his body onely was crucified and not the whole: for the other part was eaten and drunk by the Disciples before.

6. Also either Christ had one body that did Rise again and another that never rose, or else it was but one part of Christs body that rose from the dead; for the other part was eaten and drunke before.

7. The like may be said of his ascension; Then it is not Christs whole body that ascended up into heaven: for part of it was eaten before by the Disciples, and digested by them.

8. It will follow that Christs glorified body is corruptible, and may be digested by a mans stomacke, and turned into dung: For so is that which is eaten.

9. It will follow also that Christs body may become an integral part of our very natural bodies, and so his body is become sinful, as being a natural part of a sinner: for the Bread and Wine do nourish us, and turn into our substance.

10. Yea it followeth that Christ doth thus turn into the substance of every child of the Devil that eateth the consecrated Bread, and drinketh the Wine. For they certainly nourish him and turn into his substance: A most horrid consequent: For what communion hath Christ with *Belial*?

11. Nay (which is in some respect more horrid and abominable to imagine) it will follow, that the Glorified body of Christ may turn into the substance of a mouse or a Dog: for if they eat it, the bread will certainly nourish them, and become their substance.

12. It will follow that either Christ hath an insensible body, or else men hurt him by eating him in the Eucharist.

13. It followeth that Christ hath as many thousand bodies, as there be consecrated hosts, or else that by continuation of parts it is every where, and filleth all the world (which the Papists disavow.)

14. It followeth that Christs body admitteth of augmentation, and either daily or weekly receiveth new made parts, or else that he hath new bodies made daily.

15. Also it followeth that a creature (either the Baker or the Priest) may make God, or make his Saviour, at least instrumentally: which is a horrid imagination.

16. It followeth that either Christs body hath the accidents of colour, taste, dimension, &c. which are there sensible, or else that those Accidents have no subject, which is a contradiction.

17. It followeth also that Christ hath not indeed a true humane body, if it be such as is before implied.

18. And it followeth that the body of Christ is (part of it) condemned, hated of God, and tormented by the Devil. Because his body was turned into the bodies of many millions of wicked men, which must be so condemned, hated and tormented.

19. Also it followeth that the Scriptures are not true, which tell us that the heavens must receive him (in that humane nature which ascended from earth) till the times of the restitution of all things, *Act.* 3. 21. and that he shall come again to judge the world.

20. Lastly

20. Lastly it will follow that a man must not trust his senses: that though my eyes, my smell, my taste, my feeling, tell me that this is *Bread and Wine*, yet they are all deceived: and not mine only but all the senses in the world, to which they are objected. And if that be true, 1. What reason have I to trust any Papist living? For all my good opinion of him must be ultimately resolved into something that I *see* or *hear* of him: And it seems, I am uncertain whether I *see* or *hear* him indeed or not. 2. And then how can I tell that I or any man is sure of any thing? For if the senses of millions in perfect health may be all deceived in this, why not in other things, for ought we know? 3. And then how can any Papist tell that the Bread is turned into Christs body? If he say, because the Church or the Scripture saith so; How knoweth he that, but by hearing or seeing? and therefore for ought he knows his senses may be deceived when he thinketh he heareth or readeth such a thing, as well as when he thinketh that he seeth, feelth, smelleth, and tasteth Bread and Wine.

And is there not need of very strangely cogent evidence now to impell them to believe against the concurrent vote of Scripture, sense and reason? And what is the ground of their contrary belief? Not the Ancient Church (unless they willfully or negligently deceive themselves) for the stream of antiquity is full against them: so full that its hard to believe that any of them thats versd in antiquity can truly think that antiquity is for them, if they have but the common reason of men to understand what they read. What is it then that bringeth them to this belief? Is it the Scriptures? Thats not likely, because they make so light of it, and swear to take
it

it in the sence of the Church, or ancient Doctors (in which last they are here and oft most desperately forsworn) It must be then upon the Authority of the present Church, that is, the Pope and his Clergy, that they entertain this hard belief. That is, The Pope and his Clergy believe it, because they say it themselves, and the rest believe it because the Pope saith it. And is it truly possible that any man should have so good a conceit of himself, yea or any other think so well of him, as to believe unfeignedly so great a thing upon so weak a ground? Can the Pope therefore believe it because he doth believe it? Or is it not too probable that thousands of them are of that Belief which *Melancthon* sometime told them of very smartly [*You Italians (saith he) Believe Christ is in the Bread, before you Believe that there is any Christ in heaven*] while they pretend to a faith above men (that is, to believe Impossibilities upon the Popes credit) I wish they prove to have the common belief of Christians; and that in heart they do not (as once one of their Popes did) account the Gospel but a commodious fable. But let us suppose that indeed it is the word of God that is the ground of their strange belief, and that [*Hoc est Corpus meum, This is my body*] is the very word that doth convince them, as some of them do pretend. I would here be bold to aske them that say so, a Question or two: 1. What, if the Ancient Church had interpreted this Text as we do, against your Transubstantiation? would you then have believed it upon the bare Authority of this Text? What need I ask this? Your own Oaths and Profession saith, No: It is not then any evidence in this Text that compelleth your belief. And let me adde, that if I prove not (in
fair

fair debate upon a just call) that the ancient Church for many hundred years after Christ, was against Transubstantiation, I will give all the Papists in *England* leave to spit in my face (for all the high expressions of the Eucharist that some fathers have.)

2. What is there in those words [*This is my body*] that can perswade any sober Christian to their strange belief? What is it, because that they are properly and not figuratively to be understood? And how is that proved? Is it because we must not force the Scripture, but take it in the plainest, obvious sence? I easily grant it. But who knows not that both in Scripture and in all our common speech, the figurative sence is oft the most plain and obvious, and the literal the most improbable? What three sentences do we use to speak together without some figurative expression? I will appeal to any unprejudiced man of reason, whether a Christian that should newly read those words of Christ, and had never heard them or read them before, would not sooner take them in our sence, then in the Papists? They may easily try this upon a new convert, if they please: and I dare make their own consciences judge, if they have any left to befriend a common truth. What is there more in [*This is my Body*] being a Sacramental business, then for a man that is in a room among many Images, to say [*This is Peter or Paul, or this is Augustine or Hierom or Chrysostome?*] And would not any unprejudiced stander by suppose that the most obvious sence of those words is [*This is the picture of Peter, Paul, &c?*] Or would a man easily believe that it was the meaning of the speaker, that this Picture was the very real flesh and blood of *Peter* and *Paul*, and all other Pictures that ever should be

be made after the same exemplar, should be so transubstantiated? So what is the obvious signification of those words [*This is my body*] but [*This is the Sacrament or Representation of my Body?*] Especially when his real body was distinctly there present, and he expressly biddeth them [*Do this in remembrance of me.*] 3. I would desire any Papists living to tell me, why the Text doth not as much oblige him to believe that [*The Cup is the New Testament*] substantially without a figure, as that [*The Bread is his Body*] For the Text as expressly saith one as the other, *Luk. 22. 20. This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood.*] Yet I suppose they will be content to say that by [*The New Testament*] is meant, the Sacrament or Seal of the New Testament. 4. Why will not these blind wretches believe the Holy Ghost, who calls it *Bread* at the eating after the consecration? *1 Cor. 11. 26, 27, 28.* three times together; and tells us that the use of it is to remember and shew the Lords death till he come.

I might here adde to this in the next place their worshiping of Saints, especially of the Virgin *Mary*, with prayers to her as the Queen of Heaven, to forgive their sins, and to command her Son to forgive them, with abundance more of such impious, idolatrous or sacrilegious expressions, as might make the ears of a sober Christian even to tingle. But these things have been so oft told them, and are so visible in their Offices and other writings that I shall pass them over. As also their worshiping of Images, and publike using them to that end in their Churches: Though most of their Laity that I have met with, say that they use them but for a remembrance of the Saints and do not worship them (and thats bad enough

enough in such cases) yet their learned Schoolmen and Doctors tell us another tale , as is too visible in many of their writings.

Arg. 10. *That Doctrine which teacheth men to turn the most of Gods worship into meer unreasonable ceremonies and vain formalities of mans devising , is not a safe way to salvation. But such is the doctrine of Popery : I therefore, &c*

The Major is certain : For 1. God hath taken down the ceremonial Law which he himself had made , and therefore will not give leave to man to set up another in its stead , and to burden his Church with unnecessary things. 2. It is contrary to the freedom and spiritual state of the Gospel Church. The Apostle bids us stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free : And Christ saith , that God is a Spirit , and they that worship him , must worship him in Spirit and Truth : for such worshipers the Father seeketh : And he telleth the formal ceremonious Pharisees , that they worshipped God in vain , teaching for doctrines the Commandments of men, *Mat. 15. 6, 7, 8, 9. Joh. 4. 23, 24. Gal. 5. 1.*

As for the Minor , it were tedious to recite but half the *Romish* ceremonies and formalities with which they both delude and burden poor sinners. For the word of God in a tongue which they understand , they must hear a sound of a strange language which they understand not : Instead of singing praises with the heart (as *David*) and with the understanding (as *Paul* requireth) they sing over prayers and Scriptures and other things in uncouth notes and in the

Latine

Latine tongue, which the people understand not : The Eucharist or Lords Supper is also celebrated in Latine and the prayers and praises adjoyned ; and the Cup taken from the people : and all turned into a meer shew, by elevation of the host, adoration of it, gaping while the Priest doth pop the Bread into their mouthes. Prayers also are used in Latine, so that the substance of publike worship is thus made a very Picture, or unreasonable service : Yea, they teach them to pray partly in Latine in private, and partly with vain repetitions, multiplying over the name Jesu, nine times together, and rehearsing over their canting shreds, and numbering their prayers on their beads to keep tale, and observing such and such hours, and praying to Saints, to one Saint for this and another for that, giving the elogies and prayers and praises to the Virgin *Mary*, that are due to God alone : Sacraments they multiply : even Marriage which in the Clergy is a deadly sin, and the avoiding it by the Laity is a work of supererogation, yet must it be a Sacrament. The Rules of their severall Monastical orders, were tedious to recite : Touch not, taste not, handle not : such meats must not be eaten on such a day : such orders must use such meats, and forbear such : other Orders forbear other meats : some must be thus shorn, shaven, clothed ; and some thus : Much of their Devotion consisteth in being sprinkled with Holy Water, anointed with Chrysme : creeping to the Altar ; striking on the breast ; making and wearing the Cross ; setting it up, and worshiping it in high wayes and Churchyards, worshiping Crucifixes ; and bowing before the Images of God, the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, and of the Saints ; travelling to certain

Images

Images and shrines in Pilgrimage, offering to them ; especially to our Lady at some famous places ; compassing the Church so oft ; formal penances : observing multitudes of Holy-dayes for the Saints ; hearing so many Masses , saying such or such words, carrying Palms , taking ashes , carrying banners . following the Cross , and host in processions , and worshiping it, bearing candles : In Baptisme, salting, crossing, spathing, exorcizing, washing hands : Also baptizing bells: Ceremonious consecrations; saying Dirges, and Masses for departed souls : forswearing marriage : renouncing propriety : pardons and indulgencies from the Pope ; with abundance of the like delusory carnal formalities in which much of the Popish devotion doth consist. And how can any unprejudiced man, that is but possessed with the Spirit of God , and truely knoweth what it is to worship him, imagine that God is pleased with such histrionical gaudes, and childish things ? I confess the reading of their very books of devotion, their office : to our Lady , and others the like , which are stuffed with such superstitious and unreasonable passages, seems enough to me to turn the heart of a sober man against their way. For who can think that the Holy and Blessed God will be delighted in their vain babblings and childish cantings, and affected repetitions of words, and saying, and hearing we know not what ? would any wise man regard such expressions of love or honor ? If your friend or your child should express his Love and respects to you by mimick gestures, and gambals, and making strange faces, or repeating over your name nine times in a breath , or ridiculous cantings, complements and actings like a Stage Player, would you applaud, or delight in such

expressions of love and honor as these? Or would you not rather say as the Philistine King of *David*, when he spit, and scraped on the Wall, Have I need of mad men? It is sure a carnal unreasonable doctrine, that leadeth men to such carnal unreasonable services, of that God who will be served reasonably in spirit and in truth. They that have but an Image or shadow of Faith and Grace, and can expect no more of Glory, are like enough to be well pleased with these Images and meer shadows of Gods worship: But its like to be otherwise with him that hath a spirit of supplication and holiness within him, and hath known by experience what it is to walk with God, and offer him acceptable sacrifices, and to receive the tokens of his acceptance and approbation.

Arg. 11. If Popery be maintained commonly by most wicked and abominable meanes, and so by the Devil, then it is no safe way to Salvation. But the Antecedent is too true: Therefore, &c.

I speak not here of the meer miscarriages of some of their party; but of the Pillars by which the Popes Kingdome is supported; which that it is by abominable wickednesse, I shall give you but these few instances following.

1. The very business or prize which they so much contend for, is Pompe, Greatness, Dominion, yea Tyranny in the world: so that it is evidently Pride, Vain-glory, and Covetousness that sets them on, and is the Spring of all their

their contests. Whats the chief part of the quarrel, but whether the Pope and Cardinals of one City, even *Rome*, shall be the Rulers and Masters of all the Christian world, and all Princes and People obey them? What unprejudiced man can be so blind, as not to see that this contest is Tyrannical, and that their Dominion is their Religion, and their Pride is their faith, and that the question is but that which one would think Christ had once sufficiently determined, Who shall be the greatest? Did not Christ chide his Disciples for this contest? and say, With you it shall not be so? But the Papists, having no better way to prove the Scripture a nose of Waxe, and as flexible and multiform, as they accuse it to be, then by making it so to themselves by abusive violence and perverting it, putting by the plainest words that Christ can speak, and will take his Decision for no Decision, when it makes against the Decisive Power of their Pope.

2. And this is yet further manifest, in that such a multitude of their Popes have been Whoremongers, Murderers, Heretickes, Simoniackall, buying the Popedom with money, and poisoning one another to obtain the Popedom, and living in it liker beasts then men? Of all which I onely appeal to Platina and other of their own Writers.

3. Another Pillar of Popery is most unconscionable impiety: They can dispense with the vilest sins for the promoting of their Kingdom. They can dispense with Oaths and with obligations of subjects

expressions of love and honor as these? Or would you not rather say as the Philistine King of *David*, when he spit, and scraped on the Wall, Have I need of mad men? It is sure a carnal unreasonable doctrine, that leadeth men to such carnal unreasonable services, of that God who will be served reasonably in spirit and in truth. They that have but an Image or shadow of Faith and Grace, and can expect no more of Glory, are like enough to be well pleased with these Images and meer shadows of Gods worship: But its like to be otherwise with him that hath a spirit of supplication and holiness within him, and hath known by experience what it is to walk with God, and offer him acceptable sacrifices, and to receive the tokens of his acceptance and approbation.

Arg. 11. If Popery be maintained commonly by most wicked and abominable meanes, and so by the Devil, then it is no safe way to Salvation. But the Antecedent is too true: Therefore, &c.

I speak not here of the meer miscarriages of some of their party; but of the Pillars by which the Popes Kingdome is supported; which that it is by abominable wickednesse, I shall give you but these few instances following.

1. The very business or prize which they so much contend for, is Pompe, Greatness, Dominion, yea Tyranny in the world: so that it is evidently Pride, Vain-glory, and Covetousness that sets them on, and is the Spring of all their

their contests. Whats the chief part of the quarrel, but whether the Pope and Cardinals of one City, even *Rome*, shall be the Rulers and Masters of all the Christian world, and all Princes and People obey them? What unprejudiced man can be so blind, as not to see that this contest is Tyrannical, and that their Dominion is their Religion, and their Pride is their faith, and that the question is but that which one would think Christ had once sufficiently determined, Who shall be the greatest? Did not Christ chide his Disciples for this contest? and say, With you it shall not be so? But the Papists, having no better way to prove the Scripture a nose of Waxe, and as flexible and multiform, as they accuse it to be, then by making it so to themselves by abusive violence and perverting it, putting by the plainest words that Christ can speak, and will take his Decision for no Decision, when it makes against the Decisive Power of their Pope.

2. And this is yet further manifest, in that such a multitude of their Popes have been Whoremongers, Murderers, Heretickes, Simoniackall, buying the Popedome with money, and poysoning one another to obtain the Popedome, and living in it liker beasts then men? Of all which I onely appeal to Platina and other of their own Writers.

3. Another Pillar of Popery is most unconscionable impiety: They can dispense with the vilest sins for the promoting of their Kingdom. They can dispense with Oaths and with obligations of subjects

expressions of love and honor as these? Or would you not rather say as the Philistine King of David, when he spit, and scraped on the Wall, Have I need of mad men? It is sure a carnal unreasonable doctrine, that leadeth men to such carnal unreasonable services, of that God who will be served reasonably in spirit and in truth. They that have but an Image or shadow of Faith and Grace, and can expect no more of Glory, are like enough to be so.

Print Faded
Illegible in part

that it is by abominable wickedness, I shall give you but these few instances following.

1. The very business or prize which they so much contend for, is Pompe, Greatness, Dominion, yea Tyranny in the world: so that it is evidently Pride, Vain-glory, and Covetousness that sets them on, and is the Spring of all their

their contests. Whats the chief part of the quarrel, but whether the Pope and Cardinals of one City, even *Rome*, shall be the Rulers and Masters of all the Christian world, and all Princes and People obey them? What unprejudiced man can be so blind, as not to see that this contest is Tyrannical, and that their Dominion is their Religion.

and their Pride is their faith, but that which one sees sufficiently determined the greatest? Did not this contest? and be so? But the Papists to prove the Scriptures flexible and mutable, then by making violence and perplainest words that make his Decision for against the Decisive

manifest, in that have been Whore-
 ckes, Simoniacall,

and poisoning with money, and poysoning one another to obtain the Popedom, and living in it liker beasts then men? Of all which I only appeal to Platina and other of their own Writers.

3. Another Pillar of Popery is most unconscionable impiety: They can dispense with the vilest sins for the promoting of their Kingdom. They can dispense with Oaths and with obligations of subjects

2 and
 parts.

to their sovereigns, with leagues of Peace and amity among Princes, yea they can themselves actually promote and execute the most abominable impieties, that will but help them to attain their ends. I will now onely instance in that which is fresh before our own eyes in *England*. The Papists know that Anabaptists and Separatists are erroneous; they know that Ranters and Quakers are abominable; and yet for their own ends, dare they here in *England*, put on the vizard of Anabaptists and Quakers, and with all possible subtilty and zeal, and unweariedness, go up and down to seduce the people to be Anabaptists and Quakers, as they did a while ago to be Seekers, if not Infidels. This is sufficiently known and proved not only by the Popish pretended Jew that turned Anabaptist at *Hexham*, and was taken at *Newcastle*, and others of them taken, but by many other Testimonies, some upon oath of those that have heard such confessions from their mouthes; and many have known them in the Quakers Assemblies, that have seen them before elsewhere: And all this is done by them that they divide us and break us in pieces, and steal a credit to their pretended unity and Church Government, and turn the hearts of the people from our Ministry, and unsettle them, and make them more capable and receptive of their own opinions, and that they may make others abroad believe that we are all running mad. And can that doctrine be of God, which teacheth men to do such abominable things? Or is that like to be the cause of Christ that must be thus upheld? Is that person guided by the Spirit of Christ, that dares draw others to the vilest blasphemies and wickedness in a dissembling garbe, that so he may promote his own

own cause? certainly Christ needeth not such hypocrisie and wickedness for the promoting of his Kingdom; but it seems the Pope doth need it for his.

4. Another of the Pillars of Popery is most gross and impudent lying. Did I not know it to be true, I durst not accuse them of it. I will give you but these three instances following.

1. They do raise and with greatest confidence propagate, most shameless lies of those whom they take for their leading adversaries. We read them in the open writings of *Cochlaus*, *Bolse*, *Staphilus*, *Thyranus*, and many more. What abominable stories have they of the Death of *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *Bucer*, *Calvin*, and others; which it is very unlikely that they can be so blinded with malice as to Believe themselves? What conference do we ever manage with them which they do not misreport? Witness the late ridiculous passage after the conference between *Fisher* and Doctor *Featly* and Doctor *White*, when they boasted beyond Sea of the number of Converts, and in particular of two Earles, and this to the Earl of *Warwick* himself (not knowing him) who was fained to be one of them, and who had been a witness of their weakness. And how poorly doth *Weston* in his Pamphlet put this off.

2. The next instance I will give is their abominable lying legends, by which they have befooled the people, and made themselves ridiculous to the world, and occasioned others to question their reports in other things. I shall give you a taste of some of them, as Doctor *Featly* hath gathered them to my hand in his Epistle to the foresaid conference, yet with the Authors that report them, that you may try whe-

ther they be wronged. As that Saint *Brigit* laid her
wimble, and Saint *Aldelme* his chesible upon a Beam
of the Sun which supported them (*vit. Sanct. Brigit.*
& *vit. S. Aldelmi.*) That Saint *Nicolas* while he lay
in his cradle fasted Wednesday and Friday; these
dayes he would suck but once a day (*Festivale de*
Sancto Nicol) That Saint *Patrick* caused a ston
Sheep to bleat in the belly of him that had eaten
him (*Legend. de St. Patricio*) That the Corps of
Saint *Laurence* at the coming of Saint *Stephens*
body smiled for joy, and turned himself to the o-
ther side of the Sepulcher to make room for him
(*Legend. de S. Steph.*) That *Clemens* wrote a letter
to Saint *James* seven years after he was dead (*Clem.*
Ep. ad Jac. in Ep. Pontif.) That Saint *Denis* carry-
ed his head in his hand three miles, and rested at
each place of the posts, that are set between *Paris*
and Saint *Denis* (*Bren. & pictur. Dionys.*) That Saint
Dunstane held the Devil fast by the nose with a pair
of Tongues (*Leg. de Dunst.*) That the chamber of
our Lady was carryed by Angels through the air
from *Palestine* to *Loretto* in *Italy* (*Hist. de Nostre*
Dame de Loretto.) That our Lady helped Saint *Tho-*
mas Becket to mend or stich his haircloth (*Annot. in*
Clemanges ex Casario.) That a Parrot crying out,
Saint *Thomas* help me, was delivered from a Hawke
(*Legend. de Thom Cant.*) That Saint *Lupus* did shut
up the Devil in a Tankard all night (*Legend. de Lu-*
po.) That Saint *Dominicke* made the Devil hold him
the candle till he burnt his fingers (*Legend. de Domin.*
vid. Melch. Can. Soc. Theol.) That Saint *Francis*
swallowing a Spider in a Chalice, it came whole out
of his thigh (*vid. Francis.*) That Fryer *Andrew* to
correct his appetite of eating Birds at the Table by
the

the sign of the Cross, commanded them to fly away after they were roasted (*Sedw. Francis*.)

I will not trouble you with the recital of more, nor do I say that their Councils have made these Articles of faith, but their Church doth indulge and make use of such lies for the beguiling of the vulgar.

3. The third instance that I give is, their abominable forgeries, and depravations of ancient writings: Feigning Decretal Epistles of their Popes, and many other writings under the names of ancient Fathers: and presuming to expunge, alter, and falsifie the true writings of the Fathers, and of the better sort of their own, as is proved already against them by many, and I need not here recite: (See Doctor *Featlyes* aforesaid *Confer. Append.*) Which hath done us so great a mischief, by making much if not most of the writings of the Ancients uncertain to us, as is scarce easily expressible nor are they ever able to repaire (as the late King of *England* told the Marquess of *Worcester* in the beginning of their conference.) See more in Doctor *Willetts Tetraastilon Papismi*.

5. Another of the principal props of Popery, hath been most horrid inhumane bloodshed and cruelty. How many thousands of the Waldenses and Albigenes they cruelly murdered in *Savoy* and *France*, since the year One thousand one hundred and sixty. How many in *Bohemia*? How many in other Countreyes, who can possibly enumerate. *Cesarus* saith, The Waldenses had infected a thousand Cityes. *Parsons* saith, That they were so numerous that they had an Army of seventy thousand men to fight for them, and that they were
so

ther they be wronged. As that Saint *Brigit* laid her
wimble, and Saint *Aldelme* his chesible upon a Beam
of the Sun which supported them (*vit. Sancti Brigit.*
& *vit. S. Aldelmi.*) That Saint *Nicolas* while he lay
in his cradle fasted Wednesday and Friday; these
dayes he would suck but once a day (*Festivals de*
Sancto Nicol) That Saint *Patrick* caused a sholin
Sheep to bleat in the belly of him that had eaten
him (*Legend. de St. Patricio*) That the Corps of
Saint *Laurence* at the coming of Saint *Stephens*
body smiled for joy, and turned himself to the o-
ther side of the Sepulcher to make room for him
(*Legend. de S. Steph.*) That *Clemens* wrote a letter
to Saint *James* seven years after he was dead (*Clem.*
Ep. ad Jac. in Ep. Pontif.) That Saint *Denis* carry-
ed his head in his hand three miles, and rested at
each place of the posts, that are set between *Paris*
and Saint *Denis* (*Bren. & pictur. Dionys.*) That Saint
Dunstan held the Devil fast by the nose with a pair
of Tongues (*Leg. de Dunst.*) That the chamber of
our Lady was carryed by Angels through the air
from *Palestine* to *Loretto* in *Italy* (*Hist. de Nostre*
Dame de Loretto.) That our Lady helped Saint *Tho-*
mas Becket to mend or stich his haircloth (*Annot. in*
Clemanges ex Casario.) That a Parrot crying out,
Saint *Thomas* help me, was delivered from a Hawke
(*Legend. de Thom Cant.*) That Saint *Lupus* did shut
up the Devil in a Tankard all night (*Legend. de Lu-*
po.) That Saint *Dominicke* made the Devil hold him
the candle till he burnt his fingers (*Legend. de Domin.*
vid. Melch. Can. loc. Theol.) That Saint *Francis*
swallowing a Spider in a Chalice, it came whole out
of his thigh (*vid. Francisc.*) That Fryer *Andrew* to
correct his appetite of eating Birds at the Table by
the

the sign of the Croſs, commanded them to fly away after they were roasted (*Sedn. Francſ.*)

I will not trouble you with the recital of more, nor do I ſay that their Councils have made theſe Articles of faith, but their Church doth indulge and make uſe of ſuch lies for the beguiling of the vulgar.

3. The third inſtance that I give is, their abominable forgeries, and depravations of ancient writings: Feigning Decretal Epistles of their Popes, and many other writings under the names of ancient Fathers: and preſuming to expunge, alter, and falſifie the true writings of the Fathers, and of the better ſort of their own, as is proved already againſt them by many, and I need not here recite: (See Doctor *Featlyes* aforeſaid *Confer. Append.*) Which hath done us ſo great a miſchief, by making much if not moſt of the writings of the Ancients uncertain to us, as is ſcarce eaſily expreſſable nor are they ever able to reſtaure (as the late King of *England* told the Marqueſs of *Worceſter* in the beginning of their conference.) See more in Doctor *Willets Tetraſtilon Papiſmi.*

5. Another of the principal proſs of Popery, hath been moſt horrid inhumane bloodſhed and cruelty. How many thouſands of the Waldenſes and Albigenſes they cruelly murdered in *Savoy* and *France*, ſince the year One thouſand one hundred and ſixty. How many in *Bohemia*? How many in other Countreyes, who can poſſibly enumerate. *Ceſarius* ſaith, The Waldenſes had infected a thouſand Cityes. *Parſons* ſaith, That they were ſo numerous that they had an Army of ſeventy thouſand men to fight for them, and that they were ſo

so spread even in *Germany* that they could travail from *Coleto* to *Milan* in *Italy* and every night lodge with Hosts of their own profession. Yet did the Papists by fire and sword disperse and destroy them, from the year 1206. to 1228, they had so filled their prisons with those that they had leit, that the Archbishops stay it, because it was impossible to defray the charge of their food, or to build prisons for them (as they themselves speak) yet after this 1260. *Morrel* in his Memorials saith, p. 4. That there was above eight hundred thousand persons that made profession of the faith of the *Waldenses*: (And some of their own Popish writers say, that it was so ancient that they affirmed themselves to have thus continued successively from the Apostles: And yet the Papists would make men believe that *Luther* was the first founder of the Reformation) I desire the Reader that can have it to read Mr. S. Clarks general Martyrology of the persecution of the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, and also of the *Spanish* Inquisition, the *Bohemian*, and *French* cruelties, and the *Irish* of late to spare me the labor of further recital. The very perfidious *French* Massacre at once was thought in a few dayes space and a little room to murder about thirty thousand persons, and this in a pretence of peace and quietness. So many bloody bouts hath that Nation had, that it is not like to be still unavenged. The cruelty of the Inquisition in *Spain* and other parts, will hardly here be believed. The most horrid cruelty of the Papists in *Ireland* lately were beyond all the rest. The number that they murdered in time of peace by a sudden insurrection is almost incredible. In the very Province of *Ulster* alone, about a hundred and fifty thousand were computed

to be murdered. But God hath gone far in avenging their blood already. What should we mention such lesser matters as the burning so many in *Queen Maries* dayes, the Powder Plot to have blown up King and Parliament; with many such fruites of the *Romane* fury? In a word I conclude, that it is not like to be the cause of Christ that hath been so long upheld by such Devilish inhumane bloody means; nor is it like to be true Doctrine which possesseth men with such a bloodthirsty spirit; nor is it a safe way to salvation to swim thither through the blood of Saints: nor is it any better then a cruel scorning of Christ when they have persecuted him, to murder Christians by thousands for seeking Reformation, or not yielding to the *Romish* errors, and then to challenge us to name or shew our Reformed Church before *Luther*, or to accuse us of Schism for separating from them: These Wolves will accuse, where they cannot devour.

Arg 12. If Popery do adde to all these abominations impenitency and incurableness, then it is certainly no safe way to Salvation: But Popery doth adde to all these abominations, impenitency and incurableness: Therefore it is no safe way to Salvation.

I do not mean that the persons are simply incurable; but while they are Papists, or go according to their fundamental principle, they are utterly incurable and impenitent. For their Principle is that their Pope or Church cannot erre, but is infallible: And so they are bound to stand to all their Determinations right or wrong: For if they should repent
of

of any, and we return from any small or great, they should in so doing proclaim that they were fallible, and so let go the principle of their profession. So that there is no hope of repentance and amendment of any error once determined of, but onely by recanting the point of their Infallibility, to make way thereto. If therefore repentance and amendment be of necessity to Salvation, what will become of these men that suppose themselves so infallible? and how can that be a safe way to salvation that locks up the door against repentance and amendment? Popery therefore is no safe way to salvation.

Arg. 13. That profession which plungeth men into certain perjury, and engageth them to impossibilities, and contradictories, is no safe way to salvation. But such is the profession of Popery: as I shall prove even out of the Trent Oath or Confession, which I recited in the beginning.

1. They vow and swear that [All other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and Oecumenical Councils, and especially the Holy Synod of Trent, they do without doubting receive and profess] When as many of these Canons and Councils are contrary each to other, one undoing what another did, as shall hereafter be shewn: and yet they swear to receive them all. 2. They swear to receive them even [without doubting] when as they are thus contradictory, and when they confess that a true faith even in the written word of God, may have doubting mixt with it. 3. They vow and swear that [They will never take and interpret the Holy Scriptures, but according to the unanimous consent

consent of the Fathers.] When as 1. The Fathers do not unanimously consent among themselves concerning the sence of the greatest part of Scripture: and so they are sworn to take it in no sence, because the fathers are not unanimous. 2. He that knows not the unanimous sence of the Fathers, where they are unanimous, is sworn hereby to take and interpret the Scripture in No sence. 3. If by [The Church] whose sence they also swear to admit, be meant the present *Romane* Church, then that Church and the Fathers do differ in the Interpretation of many Scriptures: so that in one Article they must needs be forsworn. 4. Nay there are divers particulars of the Popish faith, yea which in this oath they swear to, which are against (much more without) the unanimous consent of the Fathers. The Fathers never consented to this very Article, that we must take and interpret the Scripture onely in the unanimous sence of the Fathers: They never consented that the Bread and Wine are truly really and substantially the whole Body and Blood of Christ by Transubstantiation? Nay the consent of the Fathers is against these: And yet these wretches swear not to take and interpret Scripture but in the unanimous sence of the Fathers, and withal swear the contrary in particulars; even that they believe that which the Fathers never consented to, but against. Never did the Fathers consent that [There are seven truly and properly Sacraments Instituted by Christ.] Never did the Fathers consent (who lived a thousand or fourteen hundred years before) that the Council of *Trent* did not erre, or could not erre: Nor [That in the Mass is offered a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and dead] Nor that the Eucharist may be

be taken under one kind, and the Cup withheld: nor [That there is a Purgatory, or the souls there holpen by the suffrages of the faithful] nor [that the Saints with Christ are to be prayed to] Nor that Images were to be worshiped] nor the power of Popish indulgencies left by Christ in the Church, and the use of them wholesome: Never did the Fathers consent that the *Romane* Church is the Mistres of all Churches: or that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ over them: nor that all Christians or Bishops or Pastors should swear true obedience to the Pope as Christs Vicar? Let these proud deceivers shew us if they can when the Fathers, or any one of the Ancients, did ever take any such oath himself, or perswade others to it? Yea or that they have consented to any one of these Articles of the *Romish* faith, and *Trent* oath? What more evident to any man that hath any acquaintance with the Fathers, then that these wretches do here most palpably forswear themselves? Even as if they should swear to believe nothing but according to the Ancient Creed, and withal swear to believe that Christ never dyed, rose, or ascended, or that there is no resurrection, or everlasting life. Certainly if the very faith of Papists be contradiction, and the profession of it plain perjury, then Popery is not a safe way to Salvation.

I would here have added as the fourteenth Argument: That Popery is a mixture of old condemned errors, formerly called Heresies; which the ancient Church hath testified against; and therefore it is no safe way to Salvation: And here I should have tryed their particular errors not yet mentioned, or insisted on, as their Doctrine of Merits and Justification

tion thereby, Satisfactions, and many Semipelagian errors, Image-worship, with many the like : But that this is beyond my present intended scope, and purposed brevity, and is so fully performed already by so many unanswerable Treatises of our Divines.

Let us next here what is said of most moment, to prove Popery to be a safe way to Salvation.

Obj. 1. That Religion which hath been delivered down from the Apostles to this day without interruption, is a safe way to Salvation (For it is the same that the Apostles and all the ancient Christians were saved in) But the Religion of the Church of Rome is that which hath been delivered down from the Apostles : Therefore, &c.

Ans. 1. There is a change of the very subject of the question. It is [Popery] that we are disputing of; and this argument instead of Popery speaks of [The Religion of the Church of Rome.] The Religion of the Church of Rome hath two parts; First, the Christian Faith: Secondly, their own corruptions depraving and contradicting this Faith: The first as it standeth alone uncontradicted in the Religion which we profess: The second is it that we call Popery, and say, It is no safe way to salvation. 2. And of this I deny the Minor, and say that Popery is not the ancient Religion, the Apostles and Primitive Church never knew it: There was no such creature as a Papist known in all the world till six hundred years after the birth of Christ: It was about 606. when Pope Boniface did first claim his universal Papacy and Head.

Headship : and after that it was not till about one thousand years that the usurpation and Tyranny was consented to any thing generally in the West : And even the multitudes , still dissented , and some opposition was still made against it ; and all the Esterne Churches and the rest of the Christian world did dissent. Of these things there is enough said to silence all the Papiſts on earth in Bishop *Uſher de contin. ſucceſſione & ſtatu Eccleſ. Occident.* and his Answer to the Jeſuites Challenge, and by Bishop *Jewell*, and Doctör *Field*, and in many of the old Treatiſes againſt the Pope publiſhed together by *Goldaſtus* , which ſhew us that he ſetled not his Kingdom without continual oppoſition and contradiction. We affirm that Popery is a meer novelty , and challenge all the Papiſts in the world to prove the Antiquity of it. When they have once arrogated to themſelves the name of the Catholike Church , and taught the people to believe as the Church believes , that is, to believe that all is true which the Pope and his Clergy will report of themſelves , it is then an eaſie matter for them to prove any thing to be true which makes for their turn : then they may ſay, The Fathers are for them , and that they have their Papal ſovereignty from *S^t Peter* , when there is never a true word in it. Then they may frame and forge new Decretals, and cut out of the Ancient Writers that which is againſt them , and bring forth ſpurious writings under their names ; and tell the people that our Religion begun with *Luther* : for its eaſie to prove any thing, where themſelves are the Judges, and no witneſſes but their own muſt be heard : But if they dare leave that hold, and come into the light, its eaſie to evince the novelty of Popery (though not of every particular error they hold.)

Obj.

Obj. 2. *If the Church of Rome be a true Church; then Popery is a safe way to salvation: But the Church of Rome is a true Church: Therefore, &c. The Antecedent is granted by most Protestants: 1 be consequence is good; for it is the true Religion that maketh a true Church and Popery is their Religion. If their Religion be not true, their Church is not true: If their Religion be true, then their Church is true: and if Church and Religion be true, then they are in a safe way to salvation.*

Ans. 1. The word [Church] doth usually signifie among Christians, a Christian society, or a company of Christians associated for Gods worship and mutual edification: sometime any company of Christians whether so associated or not: sometime those are called [Christians] as distinct from Infidels, who profess most of the substance of Christianity, but deny some part, or who profess the whole substance or the fundamentals, though they contradict it again by plain consequence in other superadded points: Though these as compared with the Orthodox are wont to be called Hereticks. We deny not but that the greatest Papists are such Christians, and that as the word [Church] is applicable to combinations or companies consisting of such materials, so far the Romanists are a true Church; supposing that we onely speak of Metaphysical Truth. But as the word [Christian] is taken for one that so holdeth the fundamentals of Christian Faith, as not to subvert them by plain consequence after he hath professed them, so it is yet under dispute whether the Romanists be a true Church, and therefore not to be taken as granted.

N

How^a

However those Protestant Divines that grant them to be a true Church, do say that it is but by a Metaphysical verity, convertible with the essence; but that Morally it is a false Church and not a true; as a thief is a True man, that is, truly a man, but he is not a true man, that is, not an honest faithfull man.

2. The thing called [The Church of *Rome*] consisteth not of Homogeneal parts: or at least that word signifieth several sorts of persons. There are some that with the Pope and his Cardinals entertain the full body of Popery, and enslave the rest: There are multitudes of the people, that silently live under them, and let them alone, and are defiled by them in many things, but receive not the great and most dangerous part of their corruption. These are not equally to be called the Church, nor are they equally in danger of damnation.

3. I deny the consequence of the Major Proposition; For if the Church of *Rome* be a true Church it is because they are true Christians, and not because they are Papists: so that to argue [The Church of *Rome* is a true Church, therefore Popery is a safe way to Salvation] is as unsound as to argue [Gibber is the Leper is a living man: Therefore the Leprosie is a thing safe or profitable to mans life] Popery is the disease of their Church, and Christianity is it that makes them a Church: You may well therefore conclude that Christianity is a safe way to heaven; but not that Popery is so.

To the confirmation I answer, That the Religion of Papists hath two parts: The Christian Religion, as they are Christians, and that maketh them a true Church if they be one. And the Popish corruptions,

ruptions, which denominate them Papists, and that makes them not a true Church, nor is a safe way to salvation.

Obj. 3. *If Papists may be saved, then Popery is a safe way to salvation. But Papists may be saved: Therefore, &c.*

Ans. To the Antecedent or Minor I answer, that Papists be not all of a sort: some may be saved, and some cannot, if they so live and dye. If you aske who may and who may not? I answer, that all those of them that hold the substance of the Christian faith, and that practically, notwithstanding their errors; or that hold no errors but what consist with the Practical holding of the Christian faith, these shall be saved: But all those that finally hold any error which for matter or manner is inconsistent with the Practical holding of the Christian faith, shall be condemned.

2. To the consequence of the Major I answer, by denying it; and that on the aforesaid account. If a Papist be saved, it is not *by Popery*, but *from Popery*. It is therefore no better reasoning than to say [If a Leper may live, then the Leprosie is wholesome, or a safe to preserve life] I have already spoke more to this. If such do live, it is with more trouble, and less comfort, and its fewer that live long with it, then of other sounder men: Men should not cast themselves into a course of great doubt and difficulty as to their salvation, and when they have done encourage themselves in it, because other men of moderate and charitable mindes are afraid to conclude that they shall certainly be damned? Is it not a great probability

ty or danger of damnation very terrible, though you were not certain to be damned.

Obj. 4. *There is but one true Church, and consequently but one safe way to Heaven: That one Church is the Romane Church: And therefore they and onely they, are in the safe way to Heaven.*

Ans. If you speak of the Universal Church, which is Christs body, there is but one and that is all true Christians. But if you speak of particular associations of Christians called particular Churches, there are many thousands: And so we say that the Church of *Rome* is (at best) but one particular Church, or one combination of some particular Churches under the Bishop of that City: But that *Rome*, or the *Romane* party, are the whole of the Catholike Church of Christ, we do with abhorrency deny.

2. If the Church of *Rome* be any part of that Universal Church, and so in a state of Salvation, or way to it, it is not as Papists, but as Christians, as was said before. And therefore though there be but one safe way to Heaven, yet that one being not Popery, but Christianity, why may not other Christians be in a safe way to Heaven, as well as the Papists? especially who are free from those dangerous diseases wherewith the Papists Christianity is corrupted.

Obj.

Obj. 5. *That Church which hath Unity, Universality, Antiquity, and uninterrupted succession of Pastors and Apostles, is the onely true Church, and consequently onely in the safe way to Salvation. But such is the Church of Rome: therefore.*

Ans. 1. This concludeth not the point in Question [That Popery is a safe way to Salvation.]

2. We deny the Major, and blame them that they still thrust it on us without proof. To the particulars, 1. If Mahometans have unity, or if Satan be not divided against Satan, it doth not follow that they have the true Church; men may agree in evil. 2. where was your universality also, when there were scarce seven Bishops left that were free from the plague of Arrianisme? Universality absolute (so that all errors or other parties should be excluded) the Church hath never had the happiness to enjoy since the beginning of its flourishing in the Apostles dayes. Universality comparatively, that is, the greater part the Arrians had, at least of the Bishops. The doctrine of the Millenaries, with many such like may plead more antiquity than Popery can: And as for succession, there is no doubt but a Bishop or Church in the line of succession may turn Heretical, and have successors in their Heresie. Have none of the Greek Churches, nor *Alexandria, Antioch, &c.* had a succession till it fell into the hands of a Heretick? and it would have been no good plea for the first Heretical Bishop or Church to plead such succession. If there be not a succession in Apostolical doctrine, the succession of persons will be no proof of the truth or soundness of the Church.

3. And for the Minor of your Argument, I answer. 1. The *Ethiopian, Alexandrian* and other Churches can as truly boast of these qualifications as *Rome*. 2. The Papists lay a higher claim to them then they can make good. As 1. I have shewed already how far they are from unity, who are not only of so many Religions or wayes of Discipline, and of so great distance in many doctrinals, as the controversies among themselves do manifest, but also are so disagreed about the very center of their union, their infallible sovereign Power, whether it be in the Pope, or a General Council, or both? Besides their unity is but of their own party, the Romanists: And so all other parties are at some unity among themselves: or many at least. If *John of Constantinople* had prevented the Pope, and got the Title of universal Bishop, or Pope, as he did (by composition) of universal Patriarch; and had pretended that this would have united the Churches, I think it would not have justified his cause.

2. How can the Papists for shame pretend to universality either as to the present or former ages? Is it nothing that all the *Ethiopian, Greek, and Reformed Churches* are not of their party, besides many a thousand more? Or will they arrogantly condemn all the rest of the Christian world as heretical, and then say that they are the whole Church? Did they not learn this of the Donatists? But what is become of their modesty who pretend to an universality, for the time past, when all the Christian world was against their present belief, and there was not such a thing as a Papist known (and revealed to us) in the world of six hundred years after the birth of Christ.

3. And

3. And for their succession, we undertake to prove it interrupted long ago, and that there were no true Bishops at Rome of a long time : Though men have sat there that were chosen by Cardinals, and call themselves Bishops or Popes, yet if according to the Scripture and ancient Councils, they were matter utterly incapable of that form, then its plain that they were but Statues, and had but the name without the thing, *i. e.* the office or authority, and therefore are unworthy also of the name it self. Let me name two or three of their own Writers that bear witness of this. And first their great parasite Cardinal *Baronius* saith (*ad an. 912. §. 8.*) [*What then was the face of the holy Romane Church? how exceeding filthy, When the most potent and yet most fordid Whores did Rule at Rome? by whose pleasure Sees were changed, Bishops were given, and Which is a thing horrid to be heard, and not to be spoken, their sweet hearts (or mates) were thrust into Peters chair, being false Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of the Romane Popes, but onely for the marking out of such times.*] And after he well addes to shew that the interruption was not like to be onely in the succession of true Bishops [*And what kind of Cardinal Priests and Deacons think you we must imagine that these monsters did choose? when nothing is so rooted in nature as for every one to beget his like*] See more in *Baron. ibid.* *Platina* speaking of the evil of those times (*de Benedic. 4.*) saith that [*By ambition and bribery the holy chair of Peter was rather seized on, then possessed.*]

Genebrard (in *Chronolog. l. 4. secul. 10.*) speaking of the great unhappiness of that age, saith, that [*In this one thing it was unhappy that for neer one hundred*

and fifty years about fifty Popes did wholly fall away from the vertue of their ancestors, being *Apotattici, Apostaticive potius quam Apostolici, Bisorderly and Apostatical, rather then Apostolical.*]

What shall we think of all thole that murdered their predecessors to obtain the place, were they capable of being true Bishops? What shall we say of Pope *Silvester* the second who was a conjurer, and agreed with the Devil to help him to be Pope, and by the deceit of the Devil was again deprived of it by suddain death? Doth the Devil make true Bishops of conjurers? I know the deceiving Papists would make the simple people believe that all these things that we say of their Popes are lies of our own forging: but men that have eyes in their heads may see who are the lyars. Their own Writers do commonly affirm the same that we affirm. A Cardinal of their own (*Benno*) in *vita Hildebrandi*, affirmeth this of Pope *Silvester*: and he lived in the times next him, and therefore might know. *Platina* another of their own affirms (*in vita Silvest.*) that [*Gelbertus impelled by ambition, and devillish desire of rule, did first by bribery (or Simony) get the Archbishoprike of Rhemes, then of Ravenna, and at last of Rome, the Devil giving him more of his help, but on this condition, that after his death he should be wholly his, by whose deceits he had obtained such dignity.*] The like hath *Lyra* in *Gloss ad cap. 14. Maccab. l. 2.* and a multitude of their Hystorians unanimously confirm it. Yea *Aeneas Sylvius* who was a Pope himself (*de gestis Concil. Basil. l. 1.*) saith [*We are not ignorant that (Pope) Marcellinus did as Cefars command offer incense to Idols, and that another, which is a greater and more horrible thing, did come to be Pope of Rome*

Rome by the fraud of the Devil.] In a word if Murderers, Adulterers, Conjurers that come in by the Devil, and Hereticks, may be true Bishops of Rome, and yet a man that believeth not the Popes Universal Vicarship can be no true Catholike Christian; then it seems, it is a greater sin not to Believe in the Pope then not to Believe in Christ, or then it is to bargain with the Devil, or be a Murderer or Adulterer? Certainly these men were as incapable of being true Bishops when these things were once publicly known of them (at least) as a Mahometane would be: And therefore there hath been many an interruption in their succession. And many a schism there hath been wherein two or three Popes have reigned at once, and he that had the greatest strength hath carried it, when his Right was not the greatest.

Query.



Q U E R Y.

*Whether the Infallible Judge-
ment of the Romane Pope, or
his Clergy must be the Ground
of our Belief of the Christian
Doctrine, or of our Recciv-
ing the Holy Scriptures as the
Word of God? N.*



Having already enquired whether the *Romanists* or the Reformed Churches are in the safe way to Salvation; we shall now more particularly enquire whether their faith or ours be built on the surer grounds. Our Belief is thus resolved: we believe the Christian Doctrine to be True, because the True God is the Author of it. We discern that God is the Author of it, both by his Intrinsicke and Extrinsicke Seals or attestations of it: in that it beareth his image and superscription, and is confirmed by his undoubted uncontroled Miracles,

racles, and other effects which lead us to the cause.
 The revealing containing signs or characters are the
 the holy Scriptures. That these Books were written
 by the Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists, and were
 confirmed by Miracles, and are uncorrupted in the
 main, we are infallibly assured of, by the evident
 certainty of the historical attestation and Tradition :
 For we depend not barely on the credit of a deceiv-
 able or deceitful man (such as is the Pope of *Rome*)
 or of any fallible Society of men ; but on such Histo-
 ry as we can prove by plain reason to be infallible ,
 containing in it, besides the Testimony of the Pope
 and all his party, the same Testimony also of all the
 rest of the Christians in the world, yea and of the
 very Hereticks who were enemies to much of the
 truth ; and enough also even from the mouths of
 Infidels to confirm us : so that by this infallible hi-
 story, and universal Tradition, we have a fuller
 discovery that these Books are the same that were
 written by the Apostles, &c. then we have that the
 Statutes of Parliaments in the Reign of King
James or *Queen Elizabeth*, are the same that they
 pretend to be : And to a man that heareth not God
 himself or the Lord Jesus or the Apostles, and hath
 not their immediate inspirations, we know not how
 the Laws of heaven should be more fitly delivered in
 an ordinary rational way, nor what surer other
 means such as we can expect, who live at such a di-
 stance from the first receivers of it : unless we would
 have God to speak to every man as he did to *Moses*,
 or have Christ or Apostles still among us, or un-
 less God must make us all Prophets by his extraordi-
 nary inspirations. And lastly, the true meaning of
 this word we understand as we do the meaning of
 other

other Laws or writings having moreover the assistance of the spirit, which is necessary because of the sublimity and spirituality of the matter, and the necessity of the great effects upon our hearts : Our Teachers by Translation and further instructions are our helpers (as they must be in other things that we would learn) and by the help of them without and of the spirit within, we are able to understand the meaning of the words (especially comparing text with text) and so receive the sanctifying impress upon our hearts. And thus is the Faith of the Reformed Catholike Resolved. He receiveth the Bible from the hands or mouth of his Teachers (and perhaps first believeth them *fide humana*, that it is Gods Word :) He knoweth that this Book was written in *Hebrew* and *Greek* by the Prophets and Apostles, by Infallible History or Universal Tradition. He knoweth that they did it by Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by the Image of God which he findeth on it, and by the uncontroled Miracles by which they sealed it. He believeth it to be True, because it thus proceeded from the Holy Ghost, and so is the Word of God who is most True.

Of the Resolution of our Faith according to the Protestant Doctrine. See *L. du Pleffis* of the Church. cap. 4. *Translat.* pag. 121. 122, 123. and *Conradus Bergius Prax. Cathol. Can.* p. 208. 209, 210. *Disp.* 2. § 125, 126. To this same sence. *Vid. & Sibrand. Lubbert. Princip. Christ. Dogm.* li. 1. pag. 20 &c.

What the Resolution of the *Romane* faith is, the Question which we are now to discuss doth intimate in part, for it cannot be laid down in one proposition, because they are of so many minds themselves. Indeed we may see in this their foundation that Popery is a very maze and dungeon; for the builders of this *Babel* are all in confusion at the laying of their first stone. Yet this much they seem to be mostly agreed in:

^a That the Scripture is the word of God, and part of the Rule of faith and duty, ^b but not the whole Rule, nor the whole Word of God, but that unwritten Traditions are the other part, ^c and the judgement of the present Church is Gods Word after a sort (as they speak)

That the Scripture hath its Authority in it self from God the prime truth, but *quoad nos*, as to us, it hath its Authority from the Church: That it is the act of Tradition or the unwritten part of Gods word to tell us that the Scriptures are the word of God, or a Divine Revelation:

^d And that it is the Office of the Church to judge both of this Tradition and the Scripture; as also to decide all

^a Bellar. *de Verbo Dei* li. 1. cap. 2. ^b Bellar. *ibid.* l. 4. cap. 3. ^c Bellar. *ibid.* l. 3. c. 10. *Gresser. de Agnosc. Script.* cap. 7. Col. 1908. *Valent. Tom.* 3. *Disp.* 1. qu. 1. *punct.* 7. §. 2. 3. But say plainly that the judgement of the present Church is Gods word. *vid. Melch. Canum.* li. 5. c. 5. q. 3. *Turnebull. in Tetragonis.* cap. 7. & 8.

^d *Vid. Malderum* 228. qu. 1. *Art.* 1. *Sect.* 6. *Stanley. princip. doct.* li. 8. c. 21. & li. 9. c. 3. *respons. ad arg.* 5.

Et in controu. rel. Contr. 4. q. 3. *ars.* 2. & *Defens. auctor. Eccles.* l. 3. c. 16. §. 4. & *Turnebull. Tetragonism.* c. 6. §. 2. 3 & 8. §. 3. *Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei* l. 4. c. 4. *Gresser. Defens. istius capituli* col. 1575, 1576, & *Defens.* c. 10. *de Verbo* Col. 1451. *sed è contra melius scribentem leg.* *Peter. de Aliaso in sens.* 1. qu. 1. *art.* 3. *littera* E. E. & *Lyrannus Prolog. in Biblia.*

con-

controversies in Religion, and to judge which is the true sense of Scripture : and that this Church must be one only, visible, infallible, authorized thus to judge by Christ; and this is onely the *Romane* Church.

Thus far the most of them seem to be agreed. But when these mysteries of iniquity come to be opened, they fall all to pieces. For 1. Sometimes they say that the judgement of the Church is Gods word after a sort : sometime that it is some middle thing be-

tween a Testimony Divine and Humane. 2. And what the formal object of faith is, they are not all of a mind : whether it be only the Prime Truth, or whether the Revelation of the Material object be any part of the formal : (But I confess this controversy is more verbal then real.) 3. And what place here to assign to the Testimony of the Church, they are not agreed neither. 4. Especial-

* *Vid* Turnebu⁹. *Te-
tragem. c. 2. a* § 5. *ad
finem.* suarez. *Disput.*
3. *de fide* sect. 2. § 5.
§ 6. *Disput.* 2. sect.
4. § 5. § *Disput.* 3.
sect. 12. § 4. Bellarm.
li 3. *de Verbo Dei* c.
10. *ad arg.* 13. & 15.
*Et Lib. de libero Ar-
bitr. c. 3. §* At Ca-
tholici. *Gresser. in
Defens. c. 10. li. 3. de
Verbo col. 1437.* *et* *sum
in sent. 3. dist. 23. § 4.
Malden. in 2ae Thom.*

q. 1. a. 1. sec. 3. *†* *Lege Riveti nostri Isagog. sac. script. cap.*
20. suarez *Disp. de fide* § 5. sect. 7. § 1. *‡* *Fid. valent. Tom.*
3. *Disp.* 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. § 12. Bellarm. l. 2. *de Sacram. in
Genere* cap. 25. suarez *Disput.* 5. *de fide* sect. 5. § 5. *sed
contra Melius Waldensis* li. 2. *Doctrin. fid. ant. c. 19. operum.* *Tom.*
1. & c. 27. *hic* Alphons. a Cast. *adu. heres. li. 1. c. 2. Melch.*
Can lib. c. 3. & li. 2. c. 1. Petr. Trigof. *in summam Bonaven. qu. 1.*
ar. 3. suarez (*contra seipsum*) *de fide.* *Disp.* 5. § 3. Bellarm. (*con-
tra seipsum*) *generalin contrav. sine. vid. & Durand. in 3. sent.*
*dist. 24. qu. 1. & Oerson. de visib. spirit. an. lect. 2. Coroll. 7. &
e contr. Johann. Driedon. li. 1. de Eccl. Script. & dogmat. cap. 1. &
Waldens. li. 2. doct. fid. antig. cap. 19. & 20. Melch. Canum Loc.*
Theol. l. 2. c. 8. p. 26, 27. &c.

ly they are divided in the main, viz. what this Church is which is the infallible Judge, and into whose judgement their faith is resolved, whether it be the present Church or the former Church? Whether it be the Pope only (at least in case of difference between him and his Council) or whether it be a General Council though the Pope agree not (as the *French* and *Venitians* say?) ^h Yea whether it be the Clergy only, or the Laity also that are this Church? Nay some of them plead Universal Tradition (as *Holden, White, Vane*, and divers other Englishmen of late) as if that were the same with the *Romane* Tradition, or as if it were the point in controversie between us and them. And ordinarily they use to tell us of [All the Church] and [All the Christian world] and to mouth it in such swelling words, that the simple hearer would little think that by [All the Church] they meant but one man, or at the utmost, him and his factious Clergy? So also they are disagreed among themselves whether ⁱ the Bishops in a General Council are Judges with the Pope or onely the Popes Counsellors? Yea or what a General Council

^h Vid. Mel. Canum, ib. pag. 27. 28, &c. contra. Th. Waldensum.

ⁱ Melc. Canus Loc. com. l. 5. c. 5. fol. 162. 163.

is? Though they all agree that it is not necessary that it be out of all the Christian world, much less the Bishops of all Churches, but onely some of those that adhere to the Pope of *Rome*, yet they agree not whether it must be freely elected by all the Bishops of the *Romish* faction, or onely so many and of such Countries as the Pope shall choose? and whether the major part of the Council must concur with the Pope, or the Pope and the Minor part may not serve

^k Mel. *Canus* l. 5. c. 5. fol. 164.
^l *Staples*. *relect.*
contr. 4. qu. 2.
in expl. art. ro-
tab. 2. 3. 4. *Val-*
entia Tom. 3.
Disput. 1. *punct.*
 1. §. 5.

^m *Canus* l. 5. c. 5. fol.
 164, 165. ⁿ Mel.
Canus ubi *sup.* & l. 2.
 c. 7. f. 27. *Bellarmin.* de
Concil. l. 2. c. 2. *fuerit*
Disput. 8. de *fide* *sec.*
 5. §. 4. *Alphonf.* a
Castro adu. *hæres.* l. 1. c.
 8. *Walderfus* *doctr.* *fid.*
 l. 2. c. 22. & 23. *He-*
canus *Tract.* de *fide* c.
 2. qu. 5. §. 4.

• *Pegiusli*, 4. *Hier.*
Eccl. c. 8. *Bellarmin.*
li. 4. de *Pont.* c. 6.
^r *Staples*. *contr.* 3. qu.
 4. *concl.* 2. *Canus* li. 6.
 c. 8.

serve turn^k. 5. So also they are ex-
ceedingly disagreed about the nature
and extent or pretended infallibili-
ty of the Church of the Pope in judg-
ing. ^l Some say that the Church judg-
eth *de medijs discursive*, *sed de conclu-*
sione per doctrinam prophetica & Di-
vinam: And so these men may affirm
(agreeably to this principle) that the Popes Definiti-
ons are part of the holy Canonical Scripture, as
Melchior Canus affirmeth he heard a most excellent
Divine confess, and citeth *Gratian* and *Innocent* also
as of the same mind. ^m And thus
all the most wicked Popes are
made Prophets, and speak by in-
spiration of the Holy Ghost. But
others of them ⁿ do deny this:
Though yet they know not how
it is that the Pope is infallible,
without declaring themselves
Enthusiasts. Also (though saith
Bellarmin. l. 4. de *Pontif.* c. 2. all
yield that the Pope may per-
sonally erre through Ignorance, yet) they are dis-
agreed among themselves whether he may be a He-
reticke. Some ^o say he may not,
and others that its most pious
and probable to think he may
not: Others reject that as false
^r and say he may: And one
would think it should have been
out of question by long experience before this time?
And *Bellarmin* confesseth that three General Coun-
cils did believe that the Pope might be a Hereticke

(ubi

(*ubi sup.* c. 11.) some say & that when the Pope is consulted and giveth his judgement in matters of faith, he cannot err (though in matters of fact he may) and that he is Infallible in his Courts and Councils, though not as a private Doctor. Others say that he cannot err when he intendeth to binde the whole Church to receive his sentence, or when he teacheth the whole Church. Others say that the Pope may err even defining in Council; but not in errors manifest to the Church but onely in new or not manifest points. Others come yet neerer the matter, and tell us merrily, that the Pope cannot so err in judgement about matter of Faith, because when he first erreth thus, he ceaseth to be Pope: but this is a hard conclusion in the eyes of their brethren.

The like disagreements there are among them about the Infallibility of a General Council: some will make it the proper seat of Infallibility, and say that the Pope cannot err if he be guided by the Council; else he

may: Others say that a Generall Council may err, if it be not confir-

med by the Pope, yea though the Popes Legates did consent: or if they do not follow the Popes instructions; But that they cannot erre if they follow

1 *Steplic. Contr.* 3. qu.
4 *Concl.* 2. *Rhemenf.*
in Luc. 22. 31. *Hare.*
in Conf. wub Roig-
nolds c. 7. *sect.* 3.

1 *Bellarmin.* l. 4. *de*
Pontif. c. 3. § 1. (*su-*
arez de fide Disp. 5.
sect. 8. § 4. *Valent.*
Tom. 3. *Disp.* 1. qu.
1. p. 7. § 40.

1 *Turrecremas.* li. 2.
summ. de Eccles. c. 12.
¶ li. 4. *part.* 2. c. 16.
Valent. ubi sup. col. 233
1 *Vid. Alphons. a Ca-*
stro li. 1. *adv. hares.*
c. 4.

them, or be confirmed by him. So *Bellarmino*, *Ca-*
nna and the late champions. And if the Pope and
 Council differ (as they have shrewdly done, when
 Councils have deposed Popes for heresie and wicked-

* *Turrecrem. summ.*
li. 2. c. 64. Andrad.
defens. fid. Trident.
li. 1. pag. 86.

† *Vid. Bellarm. de*
Pontif. li. 4. cap. 3.
Stapler. Gen. 6. qu.
3. art. 5. Valentia.
Tom. 3. Diss. 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. §. 45.

ness) some * say, that we may
 more safely follow the Council
 then the Pope. But others † say
 the clean contrary, and place the
 Infallibility in the Pope onely,
 and make it his work to reclaim
 the Council.

Though they are thus all in pieces among them-
 selves even about these their fundamentals, yet is it
 the custome of their deceitful Writers, to make the
 simple people believe that they are all agreed, and to
 tell them that they have the [Consent of the Universal
 Church, and of all the Christian world, and they
 have Universal Tradition] &c. that by the noise of
 these big words, they may do that which they can-
 not do by argument. Thus Doctor *Vane* their late
 profelite, and divers others do in their writings o-
 verlooking all their own disagreements, and passing
 on as confidently in their boasts of the [Universal
 Consent] as if they were either such Novices as
 understand not their own Religion, or such hardened
 seducers, as are not willing that others should un-
 derstand it.

Here are in this our Question contained three of
 the greatest controversies between us and the Papists.

1. Whether it belong to the Pope or *Romane* Church,

to be the Judge of Faith and Scriptures to all the world? 2. Whether the Pope or his Clergy be infallible in judging of matters of Faith? 3. Whether our Faith must be resolved into this infallible judgement of theirs? Our intent in this present Dispute is to deal most with the second, yet so as it is connexed with the other two; and therefore shall take them in on the by, but say less to them distinctly; and the rather because there is so much said already by our Divines, as all the Papists on earth will never be able solidly to answer: To let pass all those beyond Sea that have effectually confounded them, we have *Brittans* enough to hold them perpetual work: as *Jewell, Reynolds, Whitaker, White, Field, Usher, Camero, Baronius, Davenant, Chillingworth* (to whom they have lately lost their cause, by shewing in a vain and frivolous Reply, how little they have to say against him) with many more, who will either remain unanswered, or the answers will be worse to the adversaries cause, then silence it self; which we have sufficient ground already to foretell.

As to the first of these controversies (to dispatch it in short) as we distinguish between *Judicium Discretionis, Directionis, & Decisionis*, a Judgement of Discretion, of Direction, and of Decision, so we know that it is onely the later that properly denominateth a Judge in the publike and ordinary sence. Take our doctrine in these few Propositions.

1. We say that every Christian hath a judgement of Discretion, to know that the Christian Faith is true, and Scripture is the word of God: Or else he were no Christian, or faith were not an act of judgement, or Reason, but a brutish thing. This there-

fore we confess the Pope either hath or ought to have.

2. Every Pastor of the Church hath a judgement of direction; that is, it belongeth to him by office to be a Director of the people, and to teach those the Christian Faith, that yet receive it not, and to confirm those in it that have received it: And they ought to have abilities for the work of this office. If therefore the Pope were a true Pastor, Bishop, or Preacher, this power we should confess to be in him, as in others.

3. It belongeth to these Teachers also, to be specially careful to preserve the sacred Scriptures from corruption, and to deliver them down to posterity in the purity as they receive them, and to translate them into known tongues, that the people may understand them. Though others also have a part in this work, yet the Pastors of the Church have by Office the chiefest part.

4. It belongeth to them also to be witnesses and informers of the people, how themselves did receive the Faith and Scripture from their Ancestors, and to shew them how it came down to our hands by certaine Infallible Tradition from Age to Age.

5. The Church guides they are both Preservers of the Scripture, Witnesses of the Tradition, and Teachers of the truth, and have such a power of judging as belongeth to all these three.

6. In these acts of their office they ought to be Believed, and that on a threefold account. 1. Because of the evidence which they shew to prove the truth of their Assertions: Though strictly this is rather to be called *Learning*, and so *Knowing*, then *Believing*.

living : and is common to Teachers with any others that shew the same proofs ; Yet it being supposed that ordinarily they have much more Knowledge in the things which they teach then other men have, therefore we may well say that it more belongeth to them to convince, and more efficacy is in their Teaching because of their proofs, and better entertainment is due to their Teaching. 2. Such a Belief also is due to them as all men should have in their own profession, wherein they have long studied and laid out their time and labor, and wherein they are commonly known to excell other men. Every man that is less studied in Law, Physicke, or any other Science or Art is bound in reason to give some credit to Lawyers, Physicians and others that Study and Practice those Arts. This is but a humane Faith. 3. Besides this credit before mentioned which Infidells themselves may give to the Ministers of the Gospel (according to their capacities) there is a further credit due to them from professed believers, and that is, as they are officers authorized by Christ, and have a promise of his assistance to the end of the world : which though it make them not infallible in all matters of Faith, yet doth it assure them of a more than common help of Christ, if they are his servants indeed.

7. There is more of this kind of Belief due to many Pastors (*ceteris paribus*) than to one, and to the whole Church than to any part.

8. The credit of the Church or any Pastors in witnessing to the faith, dependeth on their competency for such a Testimony; which consisteth in their sufficiency or Ability, and their fidelity, which they are rationally to manifest that it may gain credit with others.

9. In things which God hath left undetermined in Scriptures and committed to the Governors of the Church to determine of; they have a Decisive Power. 1. For the Time or Place, or the like circumstances of Gods worship they are necessary in General (*viz.* there must be some Time, Place, &c.) but not in specie (such a Time, such a Place is not necessary, unless it be some that God hath already made choice of) Here the Church guides must Authoritatively Determine; whereupon the people are obliged to obey; unless in some extraordinary cases, where the Determination is so perverse and contrary to the General Rules which Scripture hath given for it, that it would overthrow the substance of the duty it self. 2. And in case of Church censures, when any man is accused to deserve Excommunication, the Church Governors have a Judicial Decisive Power, as to those ends, though not to make a man guilty that is Innocent, yet to oblige the people to avoid Communion with the person whom they Excommunicate; except in such palpable mal-administration and evident contradiction of the word of God, which may nullifie their sentence (for even here their Power is not unlimited.)

10. No man or company of men (much less the Pope) hath a proper Decisive Judicial Power in matter of Christian faith, or whether the Scripture, or any part of it; be the word of God or not?

For the opening of this, understand what we mean by a Decisive Judicial Power: to wit, such as a Judge hath in a controverted cause, where the Plaintiff and Defendant must stand to his Judgement, be it right or wrong: so that though the sentence be not just, yet must it be Decisive and obligatory: so that he hath Power to Judge *in utramque partem*, on either side, and the judgement must be valid. Such a Decisive power no creature hath in these cases that we have now in hand.

Where let it be still remembred, that it is not the name, but the Thing that we contend about. If they will call that a Decisive Judicial Power, which is so limited to one part, or side, that it shall not be valid or obligatory to the subject if it erre, or go on the other side, concerning which all men have a judgement of Discerning granted them by God (so far as they are able to Discerne, they have leave and authority) then we easily grant, that every Pastor of the Church is thus far the Judge of Faith and Scripture: That is, if any man doubt whether the Scripture be the Word of God, and ask a Preacher or Bishop, he hath Power to say, Yea: but not to say No: But this is no Judicial Power: but a Teaching and Witnessing act: For the people are bound to disobey them, if they erre, and therefore bound to try whether they erre or not; and not to follow their judgement further then it is right and sound: therefore they have no deciding Judicial Power: which I prove thus.

Arg. 1. If the Pope or any other had such a Judicial Decisive Power, then might they oblige us to Believe that there is no God, that Christ is not the Redeemer, that Scripture is not the word of God,

and so they might cast Faith and Scripture out of the Church : But this is false and abominable ; therefore the Pope hath no such Power.

For the consequence , it is manifest , supposing that the Pope should give judgement against God , Christ , or Scripture , then men must (by this Doctrine) be bound to obey it, and forsake God , Christ , and Scripture for the Pope.

Whereunto add a second Argument from a further absurdity : Then either such as renounce God , Christ , and Scripture may be saved , or else God bindeth men (by the Pope) to renounce him and the faith to their own damnation. But both these consequents are false and abominable : Therefore.

I know they will here reply , that we must not suppose that the Pope can err in his judgement , and therefore being infallible , he will certainly make no such false Decision. To which I say , 1. Why then should it be said that God hath given Authority to decide in *utramque partem* , on either side ? Doth God give a man Authority to do that , which he hath promised him and all others that he shal never do : But he will keep him from ? This is to make Gods Commissions to be impious , and his Grace to the Pope onely to hinder the execution of them in an impious way. Who dare say openly that [God hath given authority to the Pope to judge decisively and obligatorily that there is no God , Christ or Scripture , though he will graciously hinder him from so doing] If the Papists say that they do not say so , I would know then what their judicial power in these matters is ? Is it onely this , that the Pope hath Power to judge , that there is a God , a Christ , a word of God ?

God? &c. Why so have others as well he? If they shall dare to say, that matters of faith are not such to us (that is, we be not obliged to believe them) till the Pope have determined them: I answer, What! is no Heathen or Infidel bound to Believe that there is a God, a Christ, a Scripture, till the Pope tell him so? Shall all Infidels be excused in judgement, that had the Gospel preached to them by any other Christians except the Pope or others in his name? Is no man on earth bound to believe in Christ that knows not the Popes mind in the matter? And must men believe in the Pope before they believe in Christ? And must they believe in Christ onely because the Pope bids them, or because they first believe in the Pope? I do not think that either the eares of Good Christians, or rational Infidels will relish such doctrine. And what is this Believing in the Pope that must go first? Is it not to take him to be Saint *Peters* successor, and that Saint *Peter* was Christs Disciple, who had a promise of infallibility, which is now devolved to the Pope: And must this be believed before men believe in Christ? We must believe what he promised, and who were his servants, before we believe in himself? This is a ground too like the Popish superstructure.

But perhaps, they may in time grow moderate, and tell us, that it is not in all points of faith, but some onely that the Pope is made Judge: He may not judge about Christ himself, whether he be the *Messiah*; but about his Doctrines?

Ans.

Ans. 1. By what warrant will they distinguish, and claim power in one, which they have not in the other? 2. Is it all, or some of Christs Doctrines that the Pope is Judge of? If all, then it seems he must judge whether he that Believeth shall be saved, or not? Whether we should love God or hate him? Whether we should seek first Gods Kingdom, or worldly vanities? And whether a man should commit Murder, Adultery, Theft, &c. or not? May he decide these on either part? or on one only, as others may do? May he judge that there is no Judgement, Resurrection, or life Everlasting? I know they dare not say it: If it be but some of Christs Doctrines that the Pope is made Judge of, then let them tell us which it is, and give us their proofs, and they shall hear more from us. Let it be the smallest point they will imagine; Hath God given power to the Pope to contradict him and give him the Lye? If God saith, It is so: May the Pope say, It is not so? What if the Pope say that the Gospel of *Matth* or *Luke* or *John* is no part of Gods word? Must we believe him? What if he tell as that the world was made in five days and not in six? Must we believe him? 2. If they yet flye to his infallibility, I shall speak more to that anon (though the former answer may well suffice them) But to another.

Arg. 3. The Scripture is Gods Law. The Pope is not the Judge of Gods Law: therefore he is not the Judge of Scripture.

The Major I hope no Christian will deny. The Minor is evident from the nature and use of Laws and Judgements: The Law is *Norma iudicii in iudicando*: the Judges Rule: He is not to Judge the Law, but the cause of particular persons by that Law. Indeed

deed as to the right guidance of his own act of Decisive Judging the cause of the person, he hath a Judgement of discretion concerning the sence of the Law; but, as if he Judge upon a false exposition of the Law, the party may appeal from him; so (which concerneth our present case) he hath no power to Judge the Law it self: As he cannot make a plaine text to bear a false sence, or oblige the subject to believe a false sence: so in a doubtful case it belongeth to the Law-givers onely to interpret their own Laws. Onely a sentence of a lawful Judge grounded upon a false exposition, may sometime be executed among men where justice cannot be had: but no man is bound to Believe that it is true and just: *James* tells men what it is to pretend to be a Judge of the Law, in stead of doing it, and leaving that to the one Law-giver, *Jam. 4. 11, 12*: And if the Pope be made Judge of every controverted difficulty in Scripture, then why is he so unfaithful that he hath not hitherto written us an infallible Commentary on it? and why doth he not determine all the controversies about it, that among his own followers remain yet undetermined? (of which more anon.)

Arg. 4. If the Pope be made the Deciding Judge of Faith and Scripture, then either of the plain points, or onely of the controverted difficulties, or of both: But not of the plain points: For 1. That which is evident and not under controversie, needs no Judge: To the ignorant there may be need of an interpreter and teacher, but not of a Judge: 2. Such texts of Scripture do oblige us whether the Pope Judge of them or not: Therefore there is no need of his judgement that they may oblige us. Who dare think that a man is not bound by the word of God,

to love God above all, to believe the Resurrection of Christ, and of us, to love Christs disciples, &c. unless he know the judgement of the Pope. Do not all Laws of the Land oblige the subject upon the bare legislation and promulgation, before the Judge meddle with them? If they did not first oblige us to duty, there were no place for the Judge to sentence us to punishment for disobedience. It is the Legislator that obligeth to duty by his Law, proclaimed or any way published in his name: But judgement interveneth to oblige men to punishment, and bring it to execution, and to help them to that which by the Law is their right. If therefore it be evident in the very nature of Laws and judgement, that we are obliged by Gods Laws to Believe and obey them in the several particulars before any judgement of the Popes; it is then but dotage to talk of a Judicial Decisive power in the Pope to oblige men to Believe those same doctrines, and obey those same precepts of the word. And for the dark and controverted texts. 1. Those are not of that moment, as that mens salvation must lye upon the exposition of them. The points absolutely necessary to salvation are plainly delivered. 2. Obscurity shews the need of a Teacher, but not of a Judge. At least its plain, that when any Teacher shall remove the obscurity, those texts oblige us as well as the plainest. 3. As I said, If the Pope be Judge of all difficult controverted texts, he is an unfaithful Judge that will not expound them to us, and decide so many controversies as yet depend. What good will it be to the Church to have such a Judge of difficult controverted texts of Scripture, as in the consciousness of his ignorance dare not give us his judgement? but hath left them

un-

undecided these fifteen hundred years? This dumbe Oracle that hath eyes and sees not, and a mouth but speaks not, is not a fit foundation for the Churches Faith. 5. Where God calleth men to Office and Power, he accomplisheth or fitteth them in some measure for the performance of it: but God hath not fitted all Popes, no nor any, to Judge Decisively of all controverted difficultyes in Scripture, and Religion: Therefore he hath not made them Judges of them. The Minor shall be further proved anon: Many Popes have been ignorant, and unlearned; many Heretickes, unfit to decide all such controversies; and they have shewed their unfitness by their non performance or ill performance.

The great Objection of the Papists is this.

Obj. 1. *What! Shall every one be the Judge of Scripture? and take it in what sence he please? shall every unlearned man or woman expound it according to their own fancies? then we shall have variety of expositions. whether is it fitter for the Church or every simple fellow to be Judge?*

Ans. 1. Neither? Hath God made subjects to be Judges of his Lawes by which they must live, and by which they must be judged? Neither they nor your Pope, must be Judges of the Lawes, in a proper sence, but obeyers of it.

2. We say not that the people should expound the Scriptures as Teachers of others (unless in their own callings, as to the children servants, &c. when they are able) This we reserve to the Officers of the Church.

3. Nor

3. Nor do we say that any people must expound Scripture according to their own fancies or mis-guided conceits, but according to the true meaning of them. 4. Nor should they in difficult cases which are past their understandings, presume of their own wit to know the right meaning; but have recourse to the Teachers that God hath set over them, that so by their help they may learn the meaning of that word which they understood not. 5. And if their Teachers be singular, or give them just cause to suspect their skill or fidelity, they have more reason to regard the Judgement of the Judicious, then of the ignorant, and of the whole Church then of any one or few; so far as the credit or authority of men, must support a learner while he is a learning. 6. But what! Is it indeed such a monstrous heretical conceit in the eyes of a Papist, that every Christian should have a *judicium discretionis*, a Judgement of discerning to perceive and discern which is truth and which is falsehood? Good Lord, whether will the heat of contention carry men? Why if they must not have this discerning judgement. 1. Then God doth bind them all to be fools, and ignorant. 2. And then Religion and the Christian Faith, are the endowments of bruits that know not what they hold or do, and not of Reasonable men. 3. Or else they that will be Christians must have no Faith or Knowledge; which is a contradiction. Is not Faith an act of discretion? Must not he that believeth the Resurrection, and Everlasting Life, believe them with his own understanding? And doth he not in believing them, Judge them to be True, and Judge the contrary doctrine to be false? 4. Why will you read, or preach Scripture to the people, if you would

not have them receive it, by a judgment of discerning? would you not have their judgment discern the Truth of what God hath written, or the Priest shal preach to them? 5. Doubtless you will allow them a judgement of Discretion, about the Popes Decrees and Canons, and your own Determinations. How can they believe you, if they do not by judgement discern the things you say to be true? And why will you not allow them the like towards God and his Word? Will you say, It is their duty to believe the Pope, and their sin to believe God? Or its their duty to understand the Popes Laws, and their sin to understand Gods Laws? Why? what do you say less when you yield them a judgement of discretion as to the Pope or Church, and deny it in Respect to the Word of God? If you say that they will misunderstand the Scripture, I anf. 1. So will the Pope and the best and wisest man on earth in some part: because while we are here, we know but in part. 2. Their error is their sin: But doth it follow that they may not see at all, for fear of missing their way? Must they put out their eyes, and be led by the Pope, for fear of erring? Must they not know or labor to know, for fear of mistaking? Will any Master take this well of his servant, to put out his eyes, or do nothing, for fear of doing his work amiss? Or refuse to go his journey, lest he miss the way? Then we must not judge of the Popes Laws neither, and consequently, not judge them to be true, for fear of erring in our judgement. When you prove that the Church of *Rome* is the true Church, would you not have the people judge of your proof for fear of erring? This is even to make beasts of Christians. 3. What are Teachers for, but to guide them, and help

help them to understand. If you are afraid lest they should erre, be the more diligent in instructing them. But this is the difference between the work of a Popish Teacher and ours. They make it their work to put out mens eyes that they may have the leading of them, because they are troubled with an imperfection in their sight, and therefore will erre if those imperfect eyes be left in their heads: we make it our work, by all means we can use, to cure their eye sight that they may be able to see themselves, in the mean time advising them, while their eyes are under cure, not wholly to trust to them, but to use the helpe of others, to shew them the way, and to tell them of dangers. The Protestant will set his Childe to School that he may learn to know, that which through childishness he knows not: But according to the Popish way, we should forbid them all books or learning, lest they misunderstand them; and let them never know any thing lest they know amiss. The next step, is to send them to Bedlam. The Apostle would have men have their senses exercised to discern Good and Evil, *Heb. 5. 14.* The Papists would not have the people to have a judgement of Discerning: If they must not Discern, they must be ignorant: When God so much requireth and extolleth knowledge.

But I'll leave this Question, and pass to the next.

Qu. 2. Whether the Pope be Infallible, in this Decisive judgement which he pretendeth to? Which we deny.

But before I come to give the reasons of our denial,

nyal, I shall further declare our judgement about the whole matter of the Churches Infallibility, that the true state of the controversie may appear.

And 1. We easily grant that as there is an Objective certainty in all points of the Christian Faith, and in the very truth, so the Pope is infallible while he believeth and declareth nothing but the truth. He and every man else that speaks according to Gods word, is so far infallible, because that word is infallible. They need not thank us for this concession.

2. We grant that neither the Church of Rome (if a true Church) nor any other particular true Church can erre in fundamentals, or in points of absolute necessity to salvation, *in sensu composito*, that is, while they remain a true Church, they never deny the essentials of a true Church: For if they once deny the essentials, they do *eo nomine* cease to be a true Church.

3. We grant that Christs universal Church shall never deny any one point of Faith essential to Christianity, or absolutely necessary to Salvation: For then Christ should have no true Church on earth (when the whole should thus Apostatize or turn Hereticks) and all the then present world should be damned.

4. The Church as Reasonable sensible men are infallible in many matters of fact, of which they may give us unerring reports: as that, This Bible was delivered as the word of God by their Ancestors, as they might testifie it was delivered to them: and that this Creed or sum of Faith also was thus delivered in the words now in use, &c.

5. There is an infallible certainty in the evidence which the former Church hath left, and the present Church possesseth, to prove that this same Scripture was written by the Apostles and Evangelists, and was delivered to the first Churches, and from them, down to us: and that multitudes of miracles were wrought for the confirmation of the Doctrine contained in them.

6. An illiterate person may have an infallible certainty that all points necessary to salvation are expressed in certain translations of Scripture, and that so far, and much further, they are truly translated, and that such things there are in that Book as the Readers affirm there to be, though himself cannot read them. For all this is infallibly discovered by common consent, and especially of adversaries: When all men that are certainly able to judge, and are honest and impartial, affirm it without doubt, and those that would gladly contradict it, as being by their interests carryed thereto, yet cannot do it, or at least not with any considerable pretence: This gives men as infallible a proof, as the common testimony of men doth, that there is such a City as *Rome* or *Paris* which we never saw.

7. And we further grant, all that Teaching and Witnessing power to the Church officers, which was expressed under the last Question; and all that duty of Belief and obedience to them, which was there asserted. So much for our Concessions.

But we deny, 1. That either the Pope of *Rome*, or a General Council are naturally or supernaturally privileged from all error in matters of Gods revealed will, or that they are privileged from the danger or possibility of teaching these their errors to others,

others, even to the Church. 2. We deny that the Pope or the *Romane* Clergy are secured from the danger of Apostasie or Heresie : They may fall so far as to deny the Fundamentals or Essentials of Christianity, though the Universal Church shall never so fall away.

We shall first speak of the Popes Infallibility, and afterward of a General Council, that we may speak to the severall parties among the divided Papists herein.

And against the Popes Infallibility we thus argue.

Argu. 1. They that lay claim to this Infallibility, do give us no proof of their claim : Therefore they cannot expect that we should believe them. The proof lyeth on the pretenders, who give us no proof.

If they can prove it, it must be either by his natural perfection, or some supernatural endowment, by which the Pope must be more Infallible then other men : The former they pretend not to (and no wonder) The later they do pretend to : But, if God supernaturally have ascertained all Popes of an Infallibility in matters of Faith, then he hath done this either by his written Word, or by unwritten Tradition, or both : by which it must to us be proved : But he hath done it neither by his written Word, nor by unwritten Tradition. For Tradition they must shew it us, either in certain monuments of the Church which are in stead of writing (but that they cannot do) or else in the mindes of all the members of the Church. For that which concerneth all their

Salvation, must be delivered to all : But this they cannot shew : Nay we shew them the contrary : that is, the greatest part of the present Church on earth denying any such Tradition : and the most approved Writers of the former Ages, telling us the contrary, and all taking the Pope as fallible, so that they cannot give us one line of any one Father or Council for many hundred years after Christ, that ever had such a conceit as theirs. And if they will pretend to a private Tradition which none but themselves have received and are entrusted with, and so make themselves the absolute Judges of their own cause, and give us no proof but their own words, we will believe them as fast as we can, but we must desire them not to be too hasty with us.

And for the written Word they cannot thence prove a grant of their infallibility. Because they tell us that we cannot know the Scripture to be the Word of God, but by their infallible judgement : Therefore we must know their judgement to be infallible first ; and therefore it is first to be known some other way, and not by Scripture. Indeed here they have long tired themselves in their Circle, which some of them would hide by vain words if they could, but *Holden* and others of them are forced to confess it, and that they have no way out but by retiring to the universal testimony or tradition as an infallible evidence, in stead of the Authoritative judgement, or infallibility, or private Tradition of the Church of *Rome*. They tell us that we cannot know the Scripture to be the Word of God, but by the infallible judgement of their Church (And that is in the Issue of the Pope) And when we call for

the proof of that infallibility, they refer us to the Scripture. So that this is plainly to say that neither Scripture nor Papal infallibility can be proved; and so to forsake both Popery and Christianity: Then it seems, no man can know the Popes infallibility but only on the authority of Gods word, which cannot it self be known till that infallibility be known. It must be Gods Grant, written or unwritten that must prove their infallibility: But that word or Grant, written or unwritten, cannot be known to be of God, till we first know their Authority to judge, and infallibility in judging: It evidently follows therefore according to them, that neither one nor the other can be known, because no one of them can be known till the other be first known.

But 2. If we could know the Scripture to be Gods Word, before we know their infallibility in judging, yet we cannot know the true sence of that Scripture (as they confidently tell us) first: Well then, I am one that doubt of the Popes infallibility, and demand his proof: *Bellarmino* turns me to *Luk. 22. I have prayed that thy faith fail not.* I must know how I shall be sure that this is the meaning of that Scripture (which is so little apparent to an ordinary eye) He hath nothing to tell me, but that the Church saith so: And how shall I know that the Church is in the right? Why because it cannot erre. And how shall I know that? Why by this Text. And so they are amazed in another Circle, past recovery. For they expressly and frequently tell us, that the Scripture is no good evidence but when it is rightly expounded: and that no exposition is right but that which is given by the infallible judgement of the Church; and so the Popes infallibility cannot be

known till the true meaning of Texts be known that prove it; and the true meaning of those Texts cannot be known, till their infallible judgement be first known: What follows therefore, but that neither of them can be known? The true product of Popery. This is the usual success of false arguing for a good cause; to overthrow both the cause and argument: so do the Papists as much as in them lies overthrow both Christs Doctrine and their own.

3. But let us examine the particular proofs from Scripture that they bring His first proof (*lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 3.*) is from *Luk. 22.* [Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired, &c. but I have prayed for thee that thy faith faile not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.] Doth this Text say that the Pope of Rome is infallible? Yes, if you will take *Bellarmines* word. And first he tells us that (among themselves) there are three several expositions given of this Text; and it is but one of the three that will serve their turn: Good still! And how shall we know that this one which *Bellarmino* hit on, is the right? Let any impartial man peruse his reasons, and make his best of them: For indeed there is no reason in them. But on the contrary I shall presume to tell them; why I suppose that this Text doth not talk of the Popes infallibility. 1. Because here is never a word either of the Pope, or of *Rome*, or of Infallibility. 2. Because the thing here promised is expressly restrained to one individual person, *Simon*. 3. The thing here promised was about *Peters* personal Faith, and not about infallibility in judging. For 1. In that respect that Satan desired to sift *Peter*, in that respect Christ promised the not failing of his Faith. But it was in respect

respect of his personal Faith, and not his Cathedral judgement that Satan is here said to desire to sift him: Therefore, &c. 2. It is expressly said to be [his Faith] that should not fail: But his Faith, is not his tongue or Cathedral sentence: words be not Faith.

4. It is not all degree of infallibility or not failing that Christ prayeth for to *Simon*: but he onely prayeth that his Faith may not be overcome, foreseeing that it would shake, and that he would deny him: So that this is no promise of perfect Infallibility to *Peter* himself as appeared by the issue.

5. *Peter* himself was to be converted from some failing: Therefore he was not exempted from it: And the case here in hand is such as that conversion had respect to. Therefore it was not, that he should not fail in Cathedral Determinations; for he was not converted from such. *Bellarmino* here most immodestly would intimate that the text speaks not of *Peters* conversion from any sin, but of his turning to his brethren to speak to them; as if it were [When thou turnest thee to speak to thy Brethren, strengthen them] Nothing but the Popes infallibility, or the gross fallibility of common reason, could make a learned man think that this is the sence of the Text.

6. The Papists pretend that here is somewhat promised to *Peter* which the rest of the Apostles were not partakers of: But that is not so: For, if it were (as it was) that he should not Apostatize: the same was given to them all (except *Judas*). If it had been that he should be infallible in teaching the Church, so were the rest too as well as he. The reason there-

fore of mentioning *Peter* in particular, was because Christ foresaw the temptations and lamentable fall of *Peter* in denying Christ with cursing and oaths: from which he had need of a special conversion, that God might not forsake him and give him up to a total failing of his Faith.

7. Two things, saith *Bellarmino*, are here obtained for *Peter*: The one is that he himself should never lose the faith, nor fall as to his faith. The second is, that he as Pope should never teach any thing contrary to faith, or that none should ever be found in his seat that should so do: Of which priviledges (saith he) perhaps the first did not descend to his successors, but doubtless the last did.

But note here what a pass this learned Cardinal hath brought his great cause to. 1. The text speaks but of one thing and not of two: *Faith* is one thing, and *Cathedral determination* is another. Doth Christ mean both, when he names but one? Expressly it is onely the first priviledge that he promiseth *Peter*, and saith not a word of the later: It was his Heart, and not his tongue that was the seat of faith, and that Christ establisheth: which is also evident by the issue: for sure his tongue failed by speaking against the faith, when he curst and swore that he knew not the man. 2. *Bellarmino* confesseth that this priviledge [that his own faith should not fail] extendeth not perhaps to the Popes: so that for all this their faith may fail: If so 1. Then the onely priviledge mentioned in the Text extendeth not to them: For it speaks of no more: The text promiseth then nothing to the Pope, but what it never promised

to *Peter*. 2. And if it did promise both priviledges to *Peter* (that neither Faith nor tongue should fail) how can *Bellarmino* prove that one part belongeth to the Pope, when he confesseth the other doth not? The Text speaks but to the same person, and not in one half to one, and in the other half to others. I may well argue therefore in this manner: To whomsoever Christ here promiseth that his faith shall not fail, to him onely doth he speak in this text: But he promiseth onely to *Peter* here that his faith should not fail, therefore it is onely *Peter* and not the Popes that he speaks of. The Major is clear according to the intelligible sence of the words (and *Bellarmino* hath not yet proved a mystical sence) The Minor is confessed by himself.

Lastly *Bellarmino* saith (*de verbo dei li. 3. c. 3.*) that [Only out of the literal sence of Scripture, effectual arguments are to be fetched] But this great argument of his for the Popes infallibility is not fetcht out of the literal sence of Scripture: therefore by his own confession it is uneffectual and unjust.

The second Text which he cites to this use, is *Mat. 16.* [*On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*] A double argument he would fetch from hence. One from the Name *Rocke*, the other from the nature of a *Foundation*, which both imply firmeness. *Ans.* 1. Note that here is in the Text not one word of the Pope, of the Church of *Rome* more then any other, or of infallibility. 2. How doth he prove, that by the *Rocke* is not meant *Peters* Faith, or that Doctrine which he confessed but *Peter* himself? 3. If he had proved it, are not all the Prophets and Apostles as well

well as *Peter* called the foundation? *Eph.* 2. 20. So that here is no more promised to him, then what was elsewhere promised and given to the rest : Onely his present confession, occasioned the promise to be made expresse and particular at that time to him.

4. As the rest of the Apostles were the *Foundation* on which we are built, and yet their successors are not so : So though *Peter* were the *Foundation*, it followeth not that all or any of his successors are so.

The third text which *Bellarmino* citeth is *Job.* last [*Feed my Sheep.*] Where note again, 1. That here is not a word of the Pope, or *Rome*, or infallibility. 2. Did not Christ bid the rest of the Apostles *Feed* as well as *Peter*? Sure *Mat.* 28. He bid them all, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them.* And what could *Peter* do more in Feeding? Yea thirdly, Are not all Pastors, though inferior to Apostles bound to Feed the Sheep of Christ? and yet it follows not thence that they are infallible.

4. *Bellarmino* would next prove this from [The High Priests wearing the Urim and Thummim, *Exod.* 28.] When he first confesseth that it is not agreed among Jews or Christians what these are : And yet it will serve him for a proof. 2. The Priests were not infallible for all their Urim and Thummim : therefore no more is the Pope. They judged Christ not to be the *Messiah*, and therefore crucified him. They lived and died Infidels, and hardened the people in the same Infidelity, for which they were broken off and unchurched.

3. And whereas he argueth that the High Priest was infallible because the people were to go to him for resolution of difficulties, and obey them, *Dent.* 17. I must say that *Bellarmino* had some fault in his eyes that caused him to overlook the Judge, and name onely the High Priest. God sendeth them to the Judge, who was the chief Magistrate in those dayes, as well as to the High Priest; as any man that will read the text may see. If therefore the one of them be infallible, because of this, why is not the other so too? But perhaps they will make the Pope to be the successor both of the Magistrate and Priest, and so to be the universal Emperor as well as the universal Bishop; and use both his swords, that so this promise may belong onely to him: For he will hardly grant every King or Judge to be infallible.

4. By this rule the rest of the Priests also should be infallible: For the people were also to receive the Law at their mouths.

5. When was there ever one Priest in any age so impudent as *Bellarmino* and his faction are, to plead for or pretend an infallibility in themselves? Let them name one Priest or person if they can, that ever had such a conceit of themselves, except it were Gods Prophets in the matters of their Prophecy.

6. What if the Jews High Priest had been infallible? Whats that to the Pope of *Rome* any more then to another man? Hath he indeed yet proved himself successor of the Jews High Priest? Except as a corrupter of the Law, and a persecutor of the Church of Christ.

Well!

Well! you have heard all the Scripture arguments that *Bellarmino* had to bring (for he brings no more) to prove the pretended infallibility of the Pope. May I not well say that it is no marvaile that they are such ill friends to Scripture, who have no more Scripture (that is, none at all) to befriend the very foundation of their cause? And may I not justly recite again *Bellarmino's* own conclusion *lib. 3. de verbo Dei c. 3.* and from thence shew them that their cause is built upon confessed fraud and vanity [It is agreed between us (saith *Bellarmino*) that chiefly out of the literal sence of Scripture effectual Arguments are fetcht:] But *Bellarmino* bringeth no one Argument for the Popes infallibility out of the literal sence of Scripture: therefore he bringeth no one effectual Argument from Scripture.

But yet one other Argument he hath, though not from Scripture, and no more: and that is from a double pretended experience: And his first experience is [That in all the other Patriarchal seats there have been Hereticks, but not in that of Rome.] But here 1. *Bellarmino* must be judge, or the Pope who is a party, before all the Patriarchs can be thus condemned. 2. And what if that were true? Can he say the like of all the Bishops, as well as Patriarchs? If not, they may as well hence prove themselves infallible, as the Pope can do. 3. Whether ever there were in the chair at Rome either Pope *Liberius* an Arrian, Pope *Honorius* a Monothelite, Pope *John* denying the immortality of the soul, with abundance more such like, we shall have fitter opportunity to open anon, to the shame of this experiment of *Bellarmino's*.

His second experiment is that [*The Pope without a Council hath condemned many Heresies, which upon that very account have been taken for true Heresies by the whole Church of Christ*] *Ans.* But you must first unchurch the greatest part of the Catholike Church, and damne most of the Christians on earth, the *Greeks, Armenians, Abassines, &c.* and make your own faction, to be the *whole Church of Christ*, before you will ever give us the least proof of this. All the Church doth not do that which your flatterers do. Nor did the ancient Church do any such thing. As other Bishops condemned Heresies as well as the Pope, so many a Heresie was judged such by the faithful, without any more interposition of the Pope then another Bishop.

Having seen thus how little their great Champion hath to say for the Popes infallibility, I could willingly have look't about me into some of the rest of them, to see if they can say any more; but that its known that most of them tread the same path. Only I may not over pass the new way that some of them have taken up of late, to prove their infallibility, and to avoid their common Circle. And this you may see in the Jesuites late superficial answer to *Chil-lingworth*. Forsooth, they tell us, that when they prove the infallibility of their Church from Scripture, it is but for our sakes because we confess the Authority of Scripture, but not of their Church. But when they go according to the true nature and order of the matter, then they set the Church before the Scripture, and independantly of it.] The reason of this Jesuite (supposed to be *Knot*) is this [Because the Church is before the Scripture, and because the
Miracles

Miracles wrought by the Apostles did first prove their own infallibility, and from thence secondarily the infallibility of their Doctrine. And when we are in high expectations of the proofs of the *Romans* infallibility by his Arguments which are Independent of Scripture, and before the belief of it, he tells us that it is by the like Arguments as the Apostles proved their infallibility, which he thus enumerateth *So the Church of God by the like still continued Arguments and Notes, of many great and manifest Miracles, Sanctity, Sufferings, Victory over all sorts of enemies, conversion of Infidels, all which Notes are daily more and more, conspicuous and convincing, and shall be increasing the longer the world shall last*] And withall he tells us, that *[These Miracles, &c. prove them to be infallible in All things, and not onely in some, or else we cannot know which those some be, and what to believe and what not.]*

Thus you have the sum of the new Fundamentals of the Romish faith, and of the famous confutation of *Chillingworth*. But all these Knots are easily loosed without cutting; yea shake them onely, and they fall loose like Juglers Knots.

1. We easily grant that Christ the head of the Church was before the Doctrine by himself delivered in the flesh, as it containeth many things superadded to the old Testament and the doctrine of *John Baptist*.

2. Its evident that Christ himself gathered his first Gospel-Church by preaching his Doctrine, that is, he drew them to be his Disciples, by convincing them that he was the *Messiah*, the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world; so that this his Doctrine was before this his Church.

3. We

3. We grant that the Apostles were Apostles before themselves did preach the Gospel as Apostles : But it was the Gospel, and preached by Christ, before they preach't it.

4. We easily grant that both Apostles and Gospel were long before the writing of this Gospel, which we call the holy Scriptures.

5. We grant that the Apostles Miraculous works did sufficiently prove, not some onely, but all the Doctrine which they delivered to the Church or any part of it, in the name of Christ and as his : For though they confirmed onely those Doctrines which were delivered in execution of their Commission, yet seeing God would not have set to this seal, if they had gone beyond and against their Commission, therefore it also assureth us that they kept close to it. But this proved them not infallible before they received that Commission, nor afterward in any point which they should deliver as their private opinion, which they fathered, not on the Inspiration of the Spirit. The Apostles were not infallible about Christs Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, when they understood them not : The Disciples were not infallible about the Acceptableness of Infants to Christ, when they forbad them to be brought. Thomas was not infallible about Christs Resurrection when he believed it not. Peter was not infallible when he gave Christ that Satanical counsel, for which he was *tantum non* (almost) excommunicated, *Mat* 16. 22, 23. Even presently after the great promise to him ; Nor when he denied that he knew Christ, with curses and oaths ; nor when he dissembled and Barnabas with him, *Gal* 2.

6. We maintain that the Apostles Doctrine thus sealed

sealed by Miracles, and Delivered in Writing to the Churches, doth carry with it an Attestation from God of its infallibility, if there be never more Miracle wrought in the world. For the proof of this I refer the Reader to my Determination in a Book Intituled, *The Unreasonableness of Infidelity*.

7. It is this sealed Doctrine contained in Scripture, and preached by Ministers, which converteth men to Christ, and maketh them Christians, and therefore it is in order before the present Church and the cause of it.

8. We deny and confidently deny that God hath Commissioned the Pope to do the work which he Commissioned the Apostles to do, and gave them the power of Miracles to confirme, that is, to Attest the Works, Sufferings, Resurrection, and words of Christ as eye or ear witnesses of them from himself: and to be the first promulgators of some of his Laws to the universal Church, and to deliver down an infallible sealed Scripture, to all succeeding Ages, and by the ordinary working of Miracles to convince the unbelieving world. Let him shew his Commission for this Apostleship if he would be believed.

9. We as confidently deny that the Pope is a Prophet, or is inspired by the Holy Ghost, as the Prophets and Apostles were, that so they might infallibly deliver us Christs doctrine.

10. And they cannot expect that we should believe till we have some proof of it, that the Pope, or the Church of *Rome* hath the Power of working Miracles, or are endowed with a spirit of Miracles, or that they can convince those that deny the Scriptures by their own Miracles that they are the true Church,

or that ever they confirmed those points by Miracles, which is now called Popery.

Thus much to let the Jesuite know where we differ from him. And now to the point. We call for his proofs, which he here mentioneth to us in general names. *Non esse & non apparere*, are to us all one. Give us sufficient proof of your sealing the Doctrine of Popery by Miracles; or the Popes Infallibility by Miracles; as the Apostles did the Scriptures; and their preaching, and then you shall carry the cause; and we profess that we will joyfully pass into your Tents, and proclaim you Prophets or Apostles of Christ. But when we live among you, and so did our Fathers before us, and hear you prate and boast of Miracles, when we cannot see that ever you did so much as make a dead flea alive again, nor cannot see the least Miracle from you, if we would ride or go as far as our horse or legs can carry us, to see it, what can we take you for but the most shameless sort of cheaters?

If you could accuse us of negligence, as if we might see your Miracles if we would but travail for it, or of unbelief, as if we denyed that which we have evidence of, we might bear the blame: but there's no such thing. I profess as weak as I am, I would go many a hundred miles to see such Miracles as you boast of, if I had sufficient ground of expectation that I might not lose my labor. And I would read over any Volumes that I were able to find sufficient Testimony of them. But where is this testimony? *Know* refers us to *Brierly*, and others to such like reciters of their Fables. And when all is done, there are three sorts of Miracles that they

Q

speake

speak of. 1. The Miracles of the Apostles and first Churches mention in Scripture, and these are against Popery: so that we may well say that the doctrine which contradicteth Popery is confirmed by Miracles in that the Scripture is so confirmed. 2. The Miracles of the following Churches till six hundred. These were comparatively few, and less certain, and fabulous mixtures in many of the reports of them. But whatever they were, they were no confirmation of the Popes Infallibility, or universal Episcopacy or Jurisdiction, which neither the Instruments of those Miracles, nor any man else on earth, as far as can be proved did then believe. And whereas there were some Ceremonious popperies that were then used, which the Papists do yet use, and would persuade us that these Miracles were confirmations of them, we deny it, and profess the nullity of their pretended proofs. They say, [If they be not infallible in all things, how can we believe them in any thing?] I answ. Because that 1. Their Miracles are expressed Attestations to something, that is, to Christianity, but not to all things that they may think! Nor could they ever work a Miracle to confirm such private opinions. 2. And the substance of Christianity which their Miracles do attest, were more unquestionable before attested by Scripture and former Miracles; whereas the errors which they introduced are contradicted by Scripture and the Miracles that attested it.

And whereas they would make the Apostles case to be like that of the Fathers: It is very much different. For though the Apostles Miracles were attestations to all their doctrine, as well as to some part; that was because they were Officers Commissioned by Christ

Christ to that work, to deliver his doctrine first to the world, as inspired infallible men, and to seal it to posterity for future certainty; : But the Fathers had no such work in Commission; but onely to preach the doctrine thus sealed and delivered them by the Apostles, and therefore their Miracles were to another more private, and restrained use, according to their Commissions and work; that is, to convert those persons to the faith that knew of them, by a subservient attestation, so that it could oblige none to believe them in other things, much less in their mistakes.

3. The third sort of Miracles are those of later times contained in their Legends. And seriously, would the Jesuites perswade us that these are of equal authority with the Miracles mentioned in Scripture? or any whit like them? I have given you a taste of some of them in the former Disputation: more you may see of their ridiculous vanity in Doctor Franc. Whiters Defence of his Brother, pag. 147. 148.

[We must believe ^a Baronius that Saint Fulbeck suck't our Ladyes breasts: And Antonine ^b that Saint Dominick walk't in the rain and was not wet; and his Books lying all night in the river, were taken out dry and without hurt: That

^a Baron. an. 1028.
c. 3. ^b Antonin.
sum. bist. p. 3. tit. 23.
c. 4. § 6. c. 7. § 8.
c. 1. § 4. Mab.
Paris bist. Angl. in
Henric. 2. pa. 92.

the same Fryer spyed the Devil sitting in the Church like a Sparrow, and calling him to him, deplumed him, and so put him to a great reproach: And that he made the Diavel hold him the candle in his bare fingers, till they were burnt: that a lecherous Priest by kissing his hand, was cured of incontineny. That Saint Bernard by blessing their Ale, and giving it some

lewd persons to drink, caused God's Grace to enter in
to them; That he made an old Grandame of above
fourscore years old to give suck to the Infant, when
the mother was dead; That he killed Flies by Ex-
communication: and excommunicated the Devil,
and thereby disabled him from lying with Women:

c That Saint Francis turned a
Capon into a Fish, and water in-
to wine: made the Rock send forth
Water, and Anchors to swimme;

Preacheth to Birds and Beasts,
to praise God, till they were so attentive to his doctrine,
that they would let him touch them, and would not de-
part till he gave them leave, and had blessed them with
the sign of the Cross: converted a cade Lamb by
preaching to him, so that he would frequent the Church
of his own accord, and kneel before the Altar of our
Lady at the Elevation of the Host: By which ex-
ample, Surius calleth on the Hereticks to learn to wor-
ship the Blessed Virgin, and to adore the Sacrament.
Also, that he caused Swallows, Grasshoppers and a wild
Falcon to joyn with him in the Praises of God.] Abun-
dance more of the like, more foppish, and too ma-
ny to be here meddled with, their Legends are full
of; And these are their proofs of their true Church
and infallibility by which they may be known
by them that believe not the Scripture, I think
indeed that these proofs are well said to be In-
dependent of Scripture; for the less a man be-
lieves the Scripture, the more he is like to believe
these

But by what certain or probable Testimony shall
we know that ever such things were done? What!
must we needs believe every dotting Fryer that gives

us but his bare word, and that many a year (if not age) after these Miracles are supposed to be wrought: Must we believe them that so shamefully contradict one another? *Math. Paris* ^{4 Hist. Ang.} saith that Saint *Francis* was branded with his five wounds fifteen dayes ^{Henr 3 p. 329} before he dyed: But *Bonaventure*, *Vincentius* and *Swiss* say he had them two years before he dyed.

Nay must we belive as the very foundation of our Faith, that which the Papists themselves believe not? How commonly do they among themselves deride these stories, as pious fraudes, and some of them soundly chide the Authors. I will at this time cite but the words of one, and that is no Babe, even *Melch. Canus*, whom *Bellarmino* referreth us to so oft.

"[*Lib. II. cap. 6. pag. (mihi) 33. 34. Quidam*
 "*enim eorum aut veritatis amore inducti, aut ingenui*
 "*pudoris, &c. That is, Some of them (the Heathen*
 "*Historians) either induced with the love of Truth,*
 "*or in ingenuous modesty, did so far abhor a lye, that*
 "*perhaps we should be now ashamed, that some hea-*
 "*then Historians were truer then ours. I speak ra-*
 "*ther with grief then in reproach; the Lives of*
 "*the Philosophers are much more severely (that is,*
 "*truely) written by *Laertius*, than the Lives of the*
 "*Saints are by Christians: and *Suetonius* did far*
 "*more incorruptly and more entirely set forth*
 "*the affairs of the (*Romane*) *Casars*, then Catho-*
 "*likes have set forth, I say not the affairs of Em-*
 "*perors, but of Martyrs, Virgins and confessors.*
 "*For they ---- But ours do for the most part either*
 "*follow their own affections, or else of set purpose*
 "*forge*

" forge so many things, that indeed I am not onely
 " ashamed of them, but also aweary of them. For
 " I know that these have brought to the Church of
 " Christ small profit, but much disprofit: I spare
 " (mens) names because----- It is certain that they
 " who write Church History feignedly and deceit-
 " fully, cannot be good and sincere men; and
 " that their whole Narration is invented, either
 " for lucre, or for error, whereof one is filthy, and
 " the other pernicious. The complaint of *Ludovi-*
 " *cus* is most just of some feigned Histories in the
 " Church. He doth indeed prudently and gravely
 " reprove them that take it to be a matter of piety
 " to forge lyes for Religion. A thing that is very
 " pernicious and no whit necessary. For we are
 " wont not to believe a Liar, even when he tells
 " truth. They therefore who by false and lying
 " writings would stir up the minds of mortal men to
 " worship the Saints, these seem to me to have done
 " nothing else, then to make men deny belief to
 " truths, because of falshoods---- To what purpose
 " is it to pretend the name of History to fictions and
 " fables? As if the holy men of God did need our
 " Lyes ---- But while some do too much indulge their
 " own affections, and write those things which the
 " writers mind, and not the Truth doth dictate,
 " they make us such Saints, sometime, as the Saints
 " themselves would not be, if they could: Can any
 " man believe that Saint *Francis* was used to take the
 " Lice on him again which he had shak't off him?
 " The Writer thought this was part of the mans
 " holiness, but so do not I, who know that the holy
 " man was pleased with poverty, but not with filthy-
 " ness. And how ridiculous is this, that the Divil

"raging on a time against our father *Dominicke* was
 "constrained by this Saint to hold the candle so long
 "in his hands, till it did not onely trouble him, but
 "incredibly pain him. Such examples cannot be
 "numbred : but in these few most of the rest may be
 "understood, which have darkened the histories of
 "the most famous Saints ---- They do therefore ex-
 "ceedingly wrong the Church of Christ, who think
 "they do not well set forth the excellent deeds of
 "the Saints, unless they adorn them with feigned
 "Revelations and Miracles Wherein the impuden-
 "cy of men hath neither spared the Holy Virgin, nor
 "the Lord Christ --- Of late years when I was at
 "the Council of *Trent*, I heard by some that *Aloy-*
 "*sius Lippomannus* was healing this disease, by writ-
 "ing a history of the Lives of the Saints in a constant
 "and grave speech : But I could never yet see this,
 "nor any other which I could allow, of
 "all those that have come into my hands.

So far for *Melch. Canus*.

And do their own most Learned and Judicious
 Writers cry out of Lyes, and Histories so much
 more false then the Heathens, and impudent forge-
 ries, and say that, they never saw any of these
 Histories which they could allow of; and yet must
 we needs make these the Foundation of our Faith,
 instead of the sealed Word of God? What a Reli-
 gion have the Papists that is built on such a founda-
 tion !

Yea of the reports of some of the late Writers
 that were next before Popery, I will add a few
 more words of *Canus*, *ib. li. 11. pag. 337.* "[*Ci-*
 "*cero* thought *Demosthenes* nodded sometime; and
 "*Horace* thought so of *Homer* himself. For though
 "they

“they were excellent, yet but men: And the same
 “perhaps may I say justly and truly of *Beda* and
 “*Gregory*. One of them in his History of the *Eng-*
 “*lish*, the other in his Dialogues, do write certain
 “Miracles, talk’t of and believed by the vulgar,
 “which the criticks of this age will judge to be un-
 “certain. I should have more approved those Hi-
 “stories, if their authors had according to the afore-
 “said rule, to severity of judgement, joynd more
 “care in their choice ---] And how he lets fly at
 the lyes of *Antoxius* and *Valvacen*: The next page
 shews: And page 338. 339. how he censures *Ense-*
bimus himself. But I must forbear more such citations
 lest I weary the Reader.

It is now long since Doctor *John White* told them
 of their ^a Cajetans words, who saith
^a *Opuscul. de* “ [It cannot be known infallibly
^c *Concep. Virg.* “ that the Miracles upon which the
^c 3. “ Church groundeth the Canonization
^b *Part. v. tit.* “ of Saints, are true] And their ^b *An-*
⁸ *c. c.* *tervinus Florent* saith of the visions of
Bernard and *Brigit* about the Virgin *Maries* con-
 ception “ [They are fantastick visions and mens
 “ dreams] And their *Clandius Espen-*
^a *2 Tim. 4 Di-* ^c *ceus* saith “ [No stable is so full of
^{gr. 21.} “ dung, as the Legends are full of
 “ fables ---- Yea very fictions are in their portesses]
^d *Part. 1.* And *Gerson* ^d “ [All these the Church
 “ receives, and permiteth them to be read,
 “ not as certainly true, but more attending to what
 “ might be in pious recogitation, then to what indeed
 “ was done] And Doctor *White* then made a chal-
 lenge to them, that we will admit of all those Mi-
 racles, which are reported by such men, as some
 of

of their own Writers do openly Note for
Lyars. Which challenge the
Popish Replier had no mind it
seemsto take up. *White Works fol.*
248. 158.

But though it belong to the *Romanists* to prove
their Miracles (which prove their Infallibility with-
out Scripture) and not to us to prove the Nega-
tive, yet I shall try to shame their confidence by
a few pertinent Questions, when it shall appear
how little they have to say in answer to
them.

Q. 1. And first I desire to know of them whether the
Miracles that prove their infallibility without Scri-
pture are wrought by the *Present Church*, or by
the Church of former ages onely? If by the present,
why cannot we see them? Why are we still sent to
Saint *Brigit*, or Saint *Francis*, or Saint Somebody
that is long ago dead and gone? We thought
once we had had one neer us here, I mean, the Boy
of *Bilston*, who did wondrous things in favor of the
Papists; but in the Issue, by the industry of Bishop
Merton he was proved to be a counterfeit, and con-
fessed himself trained up by the Papists for the cheat.
But if it be onely the Generations that are dead and
gone that wrought Miracles, then I would further
aske. 1. Doth it not seem then that your Church is
Apostate, in that it hath lost the gift of Miracles,
which you suppose so necessary? And how will the
Gifts of your predecessors prove your present infal-
libility, any more then the Gifts of the predecessors
of the *Greek Bishops* will prove their infallibility
that now are? 2. If past Miracles may serve with-
out present, then what need any more than the old
Miracles of the Apostles? And then why are not
all

all the Apostles successors infallible as well as the Pope? Seeing all the Apostles had the gift of Miracles (and many thousand more) Therefore those past Miracles should prove all Bishops infallible that succeeded them.

2. *Quest.* I desire also to know whether it be your Pope himself that Works these Miracles, or some other persons? And if others, whether it be onely some of your Church, or all? If it be the Pope himself, why then have we more murthers then Miracles charged on your Popes by your own historians? and why will not his holiness do some Miracles in charity to poor Hereticks? Why do you boast no more of you Popes Miracles? One I confess we read of in the Golden Legend, that Pope *Leo* the first by the means of a woman kissing his hand was so vehemently tempted with lust, that he was fain to cut his hand off: but the Virgin *Mary* having compassion on him, joyned his hand to his body again. But this is no foundation of our faith.

But its plain that it is Saint *Becket*, and Saint *Brigit* and Saint *Katharine* that you send us to for Miracles, and not to the Pope: And then I would further know whether one mans Miracles will prove another man infallible unless they were wrought in confirmation of the assertion of that other mans infallibility? It should rather prove Saint *Brigit* and Saint *Katharine* infallible that are said to have the Revelations and Miracles, then the Pope, that had none. Would it prove the Patriarch of *Constantinople* infallible, if any one that is under his Government should work a Miracle? Or are you sure that there is no Miracle wrought among the *Grecians*, *Abassines* or *Armenians*? More-

Moreover, if you are All Miracle Workers, why can we never see one, nor have certain proof of one? But if it be but some very few of you (as good as none) how will that prove the infallibility of your whole Church? When the Apostles wrought Miracles, that proved their *own* infallibility: but that proved not the infallibility of all in the Church nor of every teacher in it, nor of the greater number of them

3. *Quest.* If your Pope and Church be proved infallible, by such Miracles as the Apostles were doth it not follow then that all your Popes are inspired persons or Prophets as the Apostles were by which the gift of infallibility was conveyed to them?

4. *Quest.* Yea will it not follow that all your Church are inspired Prophets, if all your Church be thus infallible: But you cannot expect that we should too easily believe these. If you have Apostolick infallibility grounded on the like Miracles, then must you not be each one dis-junctly infallible, as the Apostles were; and not onely altogether?

5. *Quest.* And is it not plain then that all your dictates are Gods word, if you have the same seal and inspiration as the Apostles had? And so your Pope, at least, if not each one of you must make us new Revelations, or new Scripture: And is not this hainous arrogancy, thus to equal your selves with Prophets and Apostles, when you are none? They could but be infallible, and so you say is the Pope, They could but seal their doctrine by Miracles, and so you say doth your Church.

6. *Quest.* Will you grant that we are all infallible here in *England*, if we can prove any Miracles done among us and by us?

7. *Quest.* Is it not absolutely necessary to the
vali-

validity of the Testimony of a Miracle, that it be not controled by some greater Miracle or evidence? Otherwise the Magicians in *Egypt*, and *Simon Magus* might have gone away with better reputation. But your pretended Miracles are controled by far greater and surer, and therefore of no force: For yours are to confirm a doctrine contrary to the Scripture, which was confirmed by many surer Miracles. This we are still ready to prove, though here we take it for certain: but you use to decline that tryal.

8. *Quest* Is not every Priest infallible, and every Church that hath the Eucharist, according to your doctrine? For sure Transubstantiation is a Miracle: I do not think you will deny it. And a Priest, even in deadly sin, may be an instrument of this Miracle, if your Church be infallible. Is there then no Eucharist among the *Abassines*, *Greeks*, or any that subject not to you? Or are they all infallible? And if Miracles be as common as Transubstantiation, the privilege proved by them must be as common. So much to Master *Knox's* first proof of his Infallibility without Scripture.

His second Independent proof, is [Sanctity] But Sir 1. Are all Saints infallible? Sure you dare not say so?

2. Will the Sanctity of one man, as Saint *Francis* or Saint *Dominicke*, prove the infallibility of the Pope that hath no Sanctity? By what means? Rather if Saints be infallible, a Murdering, Simoniack, Drunken, Fornicating Pope (as yours confess many of them were) are not like to be infallible; especially Saint *Brigit* cannot make the Pope infallible by that Sanctity, that would not make or prove her self infallible.

3. Who

3. Who must be judge of your Sanctity and ours? Your selves no doubt. For my part, if my salvation lay wholly upon the passing of a righteous censure between us in this point, I must needs profess, that even in *England*, where the Papists should be of their bell sort, because it is not the common way of the Nation, but a discountenanced way, and where they are but few, yet I have known so few of them that have not been common Swearers, Cursers, Drunkards, Whoremongers, or the like, and yet fewer that ever manifested any serious minding of God and the life to come, or any experience of the work of Sanctification on their hearts; and who shewed any more holiness than what lay in certain ceremonies, words, gestures or other formalities; and on the contrary I know so many Protestants of heavenly hearts (as far as I can judge) and obedient lives; that there is no comparison, in my most impartial judgement between Papists and Protestants in matter of holiness. If this therefore be the proof of infallibility, sure God will excuse me, if I take *England* to be as infallible as *Rome*, because he requires me not to put out my eyes, nor to say the Swan is black, and the Crow white, because the Pope shall say so before me. And yet we still disclaim all pretences to such infallibility.

The third mark that *Rome* brings, is their [Sufferings.]

But 1. Sure the Pope suffers but little (in this life: but in the next, let him look to himself) How then do other mens sufferings prove him infallible?

2. Do not the poor Greek Churches and other Christians under the Turks, suffer more then the Romanists?

3. Do

3. Do they not make us suffer incomparably more then they? Is it not impudence almost inhumane after the murder of so many thousands of the *Albigenses, Waldenses, Bohemians*, after the Massacres in *France, Savoy, Ireland*, the burnings in *England*, the Powder-Plot, after their bloody inquisition of so long continuance, and the rest of this kind, to tell the remnant of their surviving neighbors, that their sufferings prove them infallible, while our sufferings prove us Heretical?

4. Is it not ambition and desire of Rule that is the very cause which they contend for? Whats the unreconcilable quarrel so much as that all the world will not be subject to them? And yet the sufferings of these men prove them infallible? If one Butcher *Henry* the third of *France*, and another *Henry* the fourth, and others would blow up the *English* Parliament with Gunpowder, is the Pope infallible if some of these be hanged? Or what if some of them have suffered from infidels? Are not others as ready so to suffer as they? and have suffered as much as they?

The next mark that he layes down is [Victory over all sorts of enemies] But is it over their minds, or over their bodies that they mean? If the first, who must be judge of their victories, but themselves? I never heard any of them plead their cause but in my judgement they had the worst. There is no party but may turn divers others to their opinions. *Mahomet* hath got far more followers in the world then *Christ*, and *Heathenism* than either. If *Papists* can turn all these, why do they suffer themselves still to be confined to so small a part of the world? And if it be victory over mens bodies that they

they mean, I say the like. Have not the *Turkes* a larger Dominion than the Pope? Have they conquered the Great *Turk*, the Great *Mogol*, the Grand Cham of *Tartary*, &c? Are we not as infallible as they on this account, when we conquer them? It seems then, when Papists are so industrious to enlarge their Dominions, to destroy their enemies by Poisoning or stabbing Kings, or other means, it is that they may have a further Testimony of their infallibility.

The last mark which the Jesuite mentioneth, is [the conversion of Infidels.]

But: If that be a sure Mark, we are infallible as well as they: For we have been means of converting Infidels. And so have the *Greek Churches*, and others that disown the Popes infallibility.

2. If that Argument be good, then it was not only the Apostles, but all that converted Infidels at the first (or after) preaching of the Gospel, that were infallible: which sure they never pretended to.

3. If it will prove every body infallible, its liker to prove them so that did convert any Infidels, then the Pope that only gives them leave or order to do it.

4. Let them not boast too much of their conversions, till we have a better character of their new made Christians, and a better report of their means of conversion, then *Acosta* and other of their own Jesuites give us, who have been eye witnesses of the case. To cut men off by thousands or millions, and force the rest to Baptism, as cattle to watering, when they have nothing of a Christian but the name and that sign, and some forget the name it self; this is not

not a conversion much to be boasted of. Nor must they think that all are Christians that the King of Spain conquereth for love of their Gold and Silver Mines. The Apostles did not convert Infidels by an Army, but by the word and miracles; but it is the King of Spaines souldiers that have been the effectual preachers to work the conversions that you have most to glory in. If the Jesuit had put his proofs into well formed Arguments, what stuff should we have had?

So much for the Answer to *Chillingworth*, and the new Fundamentals of the *Romish* faith, by which they can prove their Pope infallible without being beholden to Scripture for its help (And I marvel not at their contempt of Scripture-Testimony to them, unless there were more, or more appearance for them then there is.)

Having considered the Papists proof of their infallibility, I shall next (though it be more then the cause obligeth me to) say somewhat to prove the Negative, and so proceed to my second Argument against them.

Argn. 2. If the common senses of sound men (or their sensible apprehensions) be infallible, then the Pope with his pretended General Council is fallible: But the common senses of sound men are infallible! Therefore, &c.

I know not how we should come neerer hand with a Papist, nor to plainer dealing, then to argue from common sense. And as to the Antecedent, Either sense is infallible, or it is not; If it be, I have that I seek. If not, then mark what follows.

1. Then

1. Then no man can be sure that the Christian Religion is true : For the proofs of it all vanish, if sense be not infallible. If you plead the Miracles of Christ and his Disciples, no man was sure that he saw them. If you plead the death and Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, no man was sure he saw them, and therefore could give no assurance of it to another. All the Disciples senses, and the worlds senses were (or might be, for ought we know) deceived. Nor are you sure that any writings or traditions came down to us from the Apostles : For the eyes of the Readers and the ears of the hearers might be deceived. 2. And then most certainly the Pope himself and all his Clergy are fallible : For they cannot be sure of that which the Apostles and following Church were not sure of : Nor can they be sure that in reading and hearing, their eyes deceive them not. And I take it for granted that the Pope and his Clergy do use their senses, and by them receive these matters into their intellect. Nay if sense be fallible, no man in the Church of *Rome* can tell whether there be any such place as *Rome*, or any such person as the Pope at all, or ever was. Nay what else can any man be sure of?

I suppose you will marvel why I bestow so many words on such a point : But you see what men we have to deal with : When all the quarrel between us must be issued by this point, whether common sense be infallible? For if it be, we infallibly carry the cause : Yea whether it be or be not, as shall appear.

I come next therefore to prove the consequence : and that I do thus.

The judgement of the Pope and his pretended General Council is directly contradictory to the apprehension or judgement of common sense : therefore if common sense be infallible, the Pope and his Council are fallible.

The consequent is unquestionable ; the Antecedent I prove by this known Instance.

Common sense takes it to be bread and Wine that remaineth after the words of consecration : The Pope and his Council say, it is not Bread nor Wine that remains after the words of consecration : therefore the judgement of the Pope and his Council is directly contradictory to the apprehension of common sense.

For the first, I appeal to the senses of all men that ever received the Eucharist. Whether seeing, feeling, smelling, and tasting, do not as plainly take it to be Bread and Wine, as they do any other Bread or Wine at their own tables ? and whether they can see or taste, or smell, or feel, any difference to give them the least cause of doubting ? I am sure I have the judgement of thousands and millions on my side, which in a matter of sense among sound men, is certainly enough. And if the Papists are so mad as to tell me, that it is otherwise with their senses ; and will seriously profess that their eyes, and taste, &c. do not take these for Bread and Wine, but perceive that they are not, I will take them for shameless liars, or madmen ; and I suppose no man in his senses will blame me for so doing. Well ! it is past doubt that all our senses tell us its Bread and Wine, as confidently as they tell us any thing is such. And it is certain that the Pope and his Council tell us it is not Bread and Wine : If our eyes be infallible that

read

read it, and our ears that hear it from their own
 mouthes; then this is sure enough and too sure; I
 know they will not deny it: I would they would, we
 should then be somewhat neerer a reconciliation.
 What now can be said to avoid the conclusion, is
 past my understanding; save onely that it is possible
 that some of them may come in with some alluding
 distinction to see if they can blind mens sense and
 reason; and so perhaps they'l tell them that 1. sense
 is infallible, on supposition of the right constitution
 of the medium, but else not: or 2. that sense judg-
 eth but of accidents, and not of substances, and the
 accidents of Bread and Wine are here; or 3. that
 sense is infallible in common cases, where substances
 and accidents are not separated, as here they be.
 To which (if such stuff deserve an answer) I reply,
 1. What medium is here questionable or questioned
 by you, but the accidents themselves, which you say
 are the objects. Sure the aire is clear and perspicuous:
 the distance is not too neer or too far off; our eyes
 and taste are sound. 2. I think senses judge of sub-
 stances with their accidents: The eye sees *substantiam*
coloratam, and the hand feeleth the *substantiam*
qualem & quantam, and not onely *qualitatem &*
quantitatem substantia. But let that controversie
 go how it will, I am sure the substance is *objectum*
sensus per accidens, though not *per se*, or that the
 intellect infallibly judgeth of substance, by the help
 of the senses apprehension. Otherwise all the fore-
 mentioned absurdities will follow, and still the Pope
 and Church will be fallible: For then the Apostles
 and others that saw Christs Miracles could be sure
 onely of the accidents, and not of the substance.

Then no man is certain whether it was Christ himself that lived on earth that was crucified, and rose again, or onely the accidents of Christ : And then no man knows whether there be a Pope at *Rome*, or onely the accidents of a Pope : and so of the rest. 3. And to the third part of the answer I reply, That if sense be infallible when substances and accidents are inseparable, then it is alwayes infallible : For the accident separated from the subject doth perish. Moreover how shall we know whether substances and accidents are separated or not ? If we be sure of that by sense, then sense is still infallible so far : if not, then sense is fallible, because it knows not when it apprehendeth any more then naked accidents. But indeed its a contradiction to talk of accidents that are not *subjecti alicujus accidentia*.

Obj. *Sense is infallible (suppose the right temper of the Organs, object, Medium) till God tell us the contrary, but then it is fallible : But in the point of Transubstantiation God hath told us the contrary to what common sense apprehendeth : Therefore here sense is deceived.*

Ans. 1. Sense must in order be first known to be infallible, before you can tell any thing that God hath said or wrote, of its fallibility or infallibility : or else you cannot tell but your eyes in reading, or your ears in hearing those words of his, did deceive you. 2. Sense and Reason are the judging faculties which God hath given to mankind for the discerning of their objects. It is not therefore to be imagined that God doth turn the great Deceiver of the world, and by supernatural light contradict the Light of Nature, even the apprehensions of the sound and general

general sense of the world: Gods supernatural Revelations presupposes his Natural ones, and are additions thereto, but do not contradict them: for then God should contradict himself when both are his Revelations. God cannot lye, saith the Apostle: And what were it for God to lye or say truth, but onely to make a deceitful or not deceitful discovery of his mind and will or the effects to us? Indeed, there may through our imperfection be a deceit of the senses, when the Organs are distempered, and the medium, or object are not conveniently disposed: and every such distance, impediment, or other ill disposure, is not as Gods voice to tell us the thing as what to our imperfect sense it seems: But if the common senses of men, that are sound and not hindred by any such impediments shall yet be all deceived meerly by a contradicting ordinance of God, then it would seem that God gave man contradictory lights and guides. And their objection seems to be as bad, as if they should say so of Gods word [That it is alway true, except where God tells us the contrary] but if it might be false at any time, how can you tell that that very word is true which you pretend doth tell you of the falshood of another word: so say I here. If sense be not alwayes infallible (where it hath its requisite assistance) then how can you tell that your senses are infallible when you are reading [*Hoc est corpus meum, This is my body*] which you think contradicteth the infallibility of sense? For 2. Is the infallibility of sense a thing that is known by nature, or by supernatural Light? Not by supernatural Light (unless consequentially) where doth Scripture or your Tradition say, that sense is sometime infallible, and sometime fallible (*suppositis re-*

quisitis)? And nature tells you no more of the infallibility of any other acts of sense (or Receptions) then of those same which you pronounce to be fallible.

3. We challenge you and all the world, to prove that ever God hath revealed in Scripture, that the common senses of men, are deceived about their proper objects, the requisites in Nature supposed; Or that ever he made any ordinances for the deluding or contradicting the senses of his Church? Or ever said any such thing; Cannot Christ say [*Hoc est corpus meum: This is my Body*] but he must needs proclaim a delusion of the senses of all men that take it to be Bread? Then when God saith [*Hoc est fœdus meum: This is my Covenant*] Gen. 17. 10. He must proclaim all mens senses deceived; because sense saith it was but Circumcision, and *Bellarmino* will confess it was but the sign of a Covenant. Then when *Paul* saith [This Rock was Christ] it must proclaim that all the Israelites senses were deceived, that thought it to be a true Rock: when a Papist will confess that the meaning is [This Rock represented or signified Christ] As if among many Images, you should say, This is *Peter*, and this *John*, and this *Paul*, this were plainly to say, This signifieth *Peter* or representeth him, &c. and doth not proclaim that deceit of sense. *Bellarmino* cannot deny but that it is called in 1 Cor. 10. & 11. Bread and the Cup six times over, as after the consecration; and here his shifting answer is, that things are said to be in Scripture what they seem to be, as the brazen Serpent is called a Serpent, and so here he pleadeth a Trope. Good still! The Scripture calls it [Bread] six times neer together, after the consecration, and it

it calls it [Christ's Body] once (when his living body
 late by) Now the Question is, which of these spee-
 ches are Tropical. And we must believe *Bellarmino*
 that the text which calls it six times Bread, must
 needs be Tropical, and that which calls it once
 [Christ's Body] must needs be understood without
 a Trope. And this is all the evidence they can bring
 that God hath proclaimed mensences to be fallible.
 Nay all that we need for our cause is but to take [est]
 for [significat] which is so common that one would
 think there should not such unnatural absurdities
 be admitted to avoid it, as overthrow our huma-
 nity.

When we plead that Christ had a true body, and
 that a true body may be seen and felt, because Christ
 bids them, *Luke 24. See and feel, for a spirit hath not
 flesh and bones, &c.* *Bellarmino* answereth that *Sence*
is infallible in positives, and therefore thence we may
say [This is a body because I see it self, but not in Ne-
gatives; and therefore we cannot say [This is not a
body because I see it not.] And what need we more
 then that which is here granted? By his own con-
 fession then we may conclude that [This is Bread and
 Wine, because we see, feel, smell, taste it.] Yet no
 doubt, we may also argue that it is not a natural
 body, because it is not visible or sensible.

• So much for this second Argument, which I may
 thus with full advantage enforce: If sence be either
 fallible or infallible, the Pope is fallible: But sence
 is either fallible or infallible: Therefore:

If sence be fallible the Pope is fallible, and all his
 Church for their sences, and the Apostles and
 their followers were fallible. If sence be in-
 fallible, the Pope and his Council are fallible; because

the common senses of all sound men take that for Bread and Wine which they expressly say (as *de fide* to be believed) is not either Bread or Wine.

Argu. 3. If the Pope and his pretended General Councils have erred already, then are they not infallible: But the Pope and his pretended General Councils have erred already: Therefore they are not infallible.

As the first Argument was taken from the no proof of his infallibility, and the second from the common senses of mankind, so the third is taken from certain experience; which is a medium so evident that their vain words and subtil evasions, have the less force to elude or obscure it. Of the validity of the consequence there is no question can be made. He that hath erred, is not infallible. All the doubt therefore is of the Antecedent, which hath by unquestionable evidence of History been put out of doubt by our Writers long ago. I shall produce some few instances of many.

Bellarmino de Pontif.
li. 4. cap. 8. 9, 10,
11, 12, 13, 14.

There are no less than fourty Popes whom *Bellarmino* himself takes notice of as charged with error or heresie, for whom he frameth such poor excuses, that I should think any impartial Reader might receive satisfaction enough from *Bellarmino* that the Pope is too fallible. Yes that even judicially and in fundamentals he may err.

Did not Pope *Liberius* erre judicially when he subscribed to
^a *Vid Binnium Tom.*
1. Conc. part. 1. p.
478. notis in 7. *Epist. Liberii* & p. 480. & p. 422. Item *Baron.* ann
357. 59. 344. 53. 4. 5. & 359. 5 4 10 & *Bellar. de Pontif.* l. 4. c. 4.

the

the *Arrians* confession in the Council of *Sirmium* [*Libenti animo suscepit in nulla contradicens*] which the Fathers condemn of Heresie? and to the Councils condemnation of *Athanasius*, as *Athanasius* himself and many more witness. Did not Pope *Vigilius* err judicially when he condemned the Decree of the General Council (for condemning dead Hereticks)? And when Pope *Pelagius* and *Gregory* the first, and *Adrian* the first did all approve of the same? Sure one party of these Popes erred, unless contradictoryes may be true? Yea when Pope *Vigilius* did afterward revoke his own constitution^b sure he erred either in making or revoking it? And so did Pope *Paschalis* when they gave God thanks in open Council that they heard the Pope with his own mouth revoke those grants which (said they) contained Heresie, which he himself had before made to the Emperor^c. Though *Cajetans* excuse be true that it was no Heresie, yet either the making or revoking was an error. What will they invent at last to hide the nakedness of Pope *Honorius* who in two several General Councils was condemned for a Monothelite Heretick? which he judicially perswaded *Sergius* to, when he sought his judgement. *Stapleton* and many more of them confess the full certainty of the Councils condemning him of Heresie; but forsooth they say the Council did mistake the case^d. It seems then either a Pope may be a Heretick, or a General Council err.

Moreover will any Papists deny that Pope *Stephen* six, and

^b Vid. Binnium not in Concil. 5. Decembris.

^c Kraulzian Saxon li. 5. cap. 38.

^d Vid. Binnium Tom. 3. part. 1 p. 143. & Staplus. Cons. 3. qu. 4. ad arg. 7.

Sergius

Vid. Sigbert in Chron. p. 74. Anno 902. & Martin. Polon. supplic. p. 158.
Alphonf. a Castro *Hereses li. 1. c. 4.* *Sergius* erred when they judicially decreed that those should be ordained again that were ordained by Pope *Formosus*. And of Pope *Clestinus* error *Alphonf. a Castro* saith that he himself saw it in the ancient Decretals as his Definition, and therefore that it cannot be said that he erred as a private man, and not as Pope. What can they say of Pope *John* twenty two who denyed the immortality of the soul, and was admonished of his heresie by the Doctors of *Paris*, as not onely Pope *Adrian* the sixth, *John Gerson*, *Alphonf. a Castro*, and others witnesse, but *Bellarmino* himself confesseth also. But he excuseth him, because that opinion was not there defined against, and therefore was no heresie: See here. Whether the Papists do not make themselves a new Faith and Religion when they please, and that is a point of Faith with them one year that was none the year before: so that the novelty and the mutability of their Religion is thus by themselves confessed. 2. See here that a point declared in Scripture, and held by the former Church is no point of Faith with them, unless it be declared by a Pope or General Council. 3. See here what men *Bellarmino* would make all the former Popes to have been, that had determined whether the soul were immortal or not. 4. *Chamier* truly noteth that *Bellarmino* himself, forgetfully contradicteth himself, and tells us elsewhere that *Innocent* the third (the nineteenth Pope before *John* twenty two) had taught the contrary in express words.

I shall forbear to reckon up any more, because the Reader

Reader may find it done so fully already in so many, and the excuses of *Bellarmino* by *Chamier* and many others so fully answered: and because it is a thing so far out of question, that nothing but gross ignorance or impudency can deny it. It is so common a thing for Popes to contradict and repeal one anothers Decrees, that their *Platina* in *vita Stephani* saith [Following Popes do alway either infringe or wholly abrogate the Decrees of the former Popes] *Erasmus* Annot. in 1 Cor. 7. saith [Pope John the 22. and Pope Nicolas are contrary one to another in their whole degrees; and that in things that seem to belong to the business of Faith] *Lyra* (in Mat. 16.) saith that Some Popes have Apostatized. *Occham* shews that many things in the Decretals do savor of Heresie. One Pope teacheth *Emanuel* King of Portugal to marry two sisters. * Another teacheth our King *Henry* 8 to marry his brothers wife: And even Pope *Paul* 4. with his Council of *Trent* decree, that it should be lawful for him to allow those degrees to marry together, which God in *Leuiticus* had forbidden and to forbid those which God had allowed: which was a judicial error of the Pope and his Council, as many more in that Council were.

But I will add another Argument like the last; which is as followeth.

Argu. 4. If the Pope be infallible, then all the writ-

Vid. Jewell Defens.
part 1. c. 3. Divis. 1. &
part. 2. c. 3. Divis. 2. &
part. 4. c. 18. Divis. 1.

See Doctor *John*
Whites way. Dig. eff.
28. p. 104.

* *Osor. de gestis E.*
manuel 1. 2.

writings of all Popes are of infallible verity: But all the writings of all Popes are not of infallible verity: Therefore the Pope is not infallible.

The consequence of the Major Proposition will be denied by *Bellarmino*, unless it be limited to such writings by which the Pope doth teach the Church in matters of faith: Though indeed they will never prove him infallible in Teaching the Church while they confess him fallible in his own judgement, yet let us for disputation sake grant them this: But then (for the proof also of the Minor) I proceed thus: All the Theological writings of *Leo*, *Gregory*, *Gelasius*, *Nicolas 1.* *Adrian 6.* and other Popes are not infallible: But all these writings were to teach the Church in matters of faith: Therefore all the Popes writings which are to teach the Church in matter of Faith, are not infallible. I think no sober Papist will maintain that all these writings are infallible. And that they are written about matters necessary to be believed or done for our salvation, is evident to any man that readeth them. And if they were not written to teach the Church to what end were they written? Do Popes publish writings about matters of Religion, and not to teach the Church by them? If they say it is but to teach part of the Church, I answer, What part is it? and where is the limitation expressed: for example, of *Gregories Dialogues*, *Morals*, *de officio Pastoris*, &c. 2. The Pope in a Provincial Council may teach but part of the Church, and yet *Bellarmino* saith that he is there infallible.

Moreover if all the Popes writings be infallible, from his gift of infallibility, then they are equal to the Scriptures; nay what are they but Gods word, and

and all Popes are Apostles or Prophets, that is, inspired men (of which more anon:) but thats false: Therefore.

Obj. *These writings come not from the Pope as Pope, but as a private Doctor, and so he may err.*

Ans^r. Can the Pope lay by his relation when he is teaching the Church, & do it as a meer private Doctor, when he is not a meer private Doctor? It is a hard strait that the Papists are in to tell us, and themselves, when the Pope teacheth as a private Doctor, and when as Pope? They are never likely to be agreed about this among them. And all that we have for it, is but the private word of *Bellarmino* and some such disputers; but we have no Scripture, Canon, or Decretal, to tell us how we shall know one from the other. If therefore we have no infallible means to know when the Pope teacheth as a Pope, and when as private Doctor, then we have no infallible means to know when he teacheth infallibly: But the former is most certain, therefore so is the later: And so if the Pope were infallible, it would do us no good. If they draw forth rational probabilities, and make every private man judge of them, they may as well warrant men by such means, to judge of the sense of Scripture, which they so much abhor.

Argu. 5. If General Councils be infallible, or to be credited, then the Pope is fallible: But according to one party of the Papists, a General Council is infallible: therefore the Pope is fallible.

The consequence of the Major is easily proved.

1. Because General Councils have differed from the Pope

Pope. 2. Yea they have deposed divers Popes, and that for heresie : charging divers Articles against them, as also for wickedness of life. The Council at *Pisa* deposed two Popes at once, *Gregory* the 12. and *Benedict* the 13. and in the tenor of their deprivation call them [*Notorious schismaticks, hereticks departed from the faith, scandalizing the whole Church, cut off from the Church, unworthy the Papacy*]

^a *Theodor. Nicen. de schismat. l. 3. c. 44. p. 91.*

Antonin. summ. hist. part. 3. tit. 22. c. 5. § 3.

^b *Antonin. ibid. c. 6. § 2. concil. const. sess. 37.*

^c *Bini. p. 1584. Conc. Const.*

^a The Council of *Constance* deposed the same Pope *Benedict* again, commanding all men to esteem him as an heretick and schismatick. The same Council deposed also *John* 23. accused for holding^c and defending as his judgement that there is no eternal life, nor

immortality of the soul, nor resurrection of the dead, and so was a stark infidel. Concerning this Pope I would desire the impartial Reader to observe what a miserable answer *Bellarmino* is put to give ? and whether it do not plainly give up their whole cause ? His words are these (*de Pontif. li. 4. c. 14.*)

“ [*Respondeo Johannem 23. non fuisse Pontificem*
 “ *omnino certum & indubitatum, proinde non necessa-*
 “ *rio esse defendendum : erant enim eo tempore tres qui*
 “ *Pontifices haberi volebant : Gregorius 12. Bene-*
 “ *dictus 13. & Johannes 23. nec poterat facile judica-*
 “ *ri quis eorum verus ac legitimus esset Pontifex cum*
 “ *non deessent singulis doctissimi patroni.*] That is [I
 “ answer that *John* the 23. was not a Pope altogether
 “ certain and undoubted : and therefore it is not ne-
 “ cessary that he be defended : for at that time there
 “ were three that would be taken for Popes, *Gregory*
 “ the

"the 12. *Benedict*. the 13. and *John* 23. and it could
 "not easily be judged which of them was true and
 "lawful Pope, seeing there were not wanting to
 "each of them most learned Patrons] So far *Bellar-
 mine*.

Where observe 1. That even learned men, yea
 General Councils, and the Church may be uncer-
 tain which is the true Pope. Its worth the en-
 quiring then, whether they be not uncertain that
 the *Romane* succession is interrupted; and uncertain
 at that time whether God had any word? or what
 was the sence of it? and whether it was certain to
 them that the Church failed not, when they had no
 certainty of the head? and whether their head and
 so their Church were then visible or invisible, when
 they could so hardly be known? And note, that
Bellarmino doth disclaim the Com-popes with
 this *John* 23. and saith elsewhere, that it was most
 likely that this was the true Pope. They have
 brought their glorious head, Church and infallibility
 to a fair pass!

Besides this, the General Council at *Basill* did
 shortly after depose Pope *Eugenius* the forth, de-
 claring him to be [*A rebel against the holy Canons,*
a notorious disturber and scandalizer of the peace
and unity of the Church, a Simonist, and a per-
jured wretch, incorrigible, a

schismatick and an obstinate * *Vid. Enau Sylvi.*
heretick] * To this *Bellar-* *gest. Concil. Basl. li. 2.*

And note that this *Euge-*
nium by force kept the Popedom after a General Coun-
 cil had deposed him for these crimes: How then can the
 succeeding Popes have a just title, and *Rome* pretend to an in-
 interrupted succession, or any other Bishops or Presbyters from
 them?

mine hath not a word to say, but onely that the Council did him wrong, and at *Lausanna* undid their acts. And thus he is content to grant that 1. A General Council may erre (which he maintaineth) 2. And that a Pope may be a heretick and to be deposed in the judgement of a General Council? And are the Papists forced to yield us thus much? I would fain know then from *Bellarmino* or any Papists surviving him, whether that General Councils do erre in faith, and be Hereticks or not, for that their judgement? If they do so err, then where is the visibility of their Church with the rest of its privileges which they so boast of, when its Representative body, a General Council are Hereticks, as thinking the Pope to be fallible? But if they erred not *de fide*, or were no hereticks. 1. Then its seems the Popes infallibility is no fundamental. 2. Then it seems we are no hereticks neither, for denying that which General Councils of Papists (pretended by them to be General) have denied. 3. Nay why should they be angry with men for erring such an error (as they account it) which their own general Councils may one after another erre.

Argu. 6. From the Papists own open known confession: If the Papists themselves do confess both Pope and Council to be fallible, they have little reason to blame us for affirming the same which they confess: But the Papists themselves do confess both Pope and General Council to be fallible: Therefore, &c.

I do not mean that all the Papists confess it of both, but one part of them confess it of one and the other

of

of the other of them. *Bellarmino* and his fellow Jesuites with the *Italian* party do confess that a General Council may erre in matters of Faith: The *French* and *Venetian* Papists, with all the Doctors of their party affirm that the Pope may erre and be a heretick, and teach heresie: so that by the confession of one half of them a Council may erre and by the confession of the other half the Pope may erre.

If any imagine that though both may erre dis-junctly, yet not conjunctly, I shall onely now say, that the concession that each of them dis-junctly may erre, destroyeth the force of all those Arguments which are brought for their infallibility; and therefore will prove it of them also conjunctly. But we have yet further proof.

Argu. 7. If the very substance of Popery be nothing but a fardell of errors brought in by the Pope and his Council to corrupt the Christian Religion among them, then certainly the Pope and his Council may erre: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore so is the consequent.

All the Question being of the Antecedent, and it being proved before in the former disputation, and fully by our writers against them, I shall thither for brevity refer you. What impudency is it to introduce such abundance of corruptions contrary to the expresse word of God and after all this to say, they cannot erre when they have so plagued the Church with their errors? They teach men to serve God in an unknown tongue, and speak and hear they know not what, to worship the Bread with divine Worship, to

receive onely the bread, when Christ ordained that they should have the cup, and so do abolish one half of the Sacrament, they adore the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints, they plead for justification by the merit of their own works, as having a condignity of the reward; they make the Church a new thing by making a new head and center of unity and a new and daily mutable Religion, in a word they poison both Church policie, Worship and Doctrine by their errors; and when they have done they stand to it that they cannot erre. Like a Leper that should maintain he cannot possibly be Leprous, when he is covered with it already: or like a swearing or drunken beast, that should swear that he never did swear nor was drunk, nor ever can be, when he lyeth drunk in the dirt, and breaths out his oaths. What need any impartial discerning man any other proof that the Pope and the Church of *Rome* is not infallible, then actually to observe the swarm of their errors that have troubled the Church?

Argu. 8. If the Popes themselves are to be believed, or if they are not to be believed, they are not infallible. But either they are to be believed or not: Therefore.

If they be not to be believed, what need there any more proof? If they are, what need there also any more proof, when they themselves confess themselves fallible? Not a Pope for above six hundred years after Christ did ever pretend to infallibility as can be proved: Pope *Adrian* the sixth, one of the most Learned and best that ever they had this many hundred years, hath written his judgement that the

Pope

Pope may erre. And I think he is liker to know himself, as to his infirmities, than any of his flatterers are. His words are these *De Sacram. Confirm. art. 4. ad fin.* "[Dico, quod si per Ecclesiam Romanam intelligatur caput ejus, puta Pontifex, certum est quod possit errare, etiam in iis qua tangunt fidem; hanc fin per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo: plures enim fuerunt Pontifices Romanum heretici] That is [I say, that if by the Church of Rome be meant the Head of it, to wit, the Pope, it is certain that he may erre, even in those things that touch the faith by asserting heresie by his Determination or Decretal: for there have many Popes of Rome been hereticks.] Thus you hear what a Pope sayes of himself.

Argu. 9. If the Pope be infallible, then either it is his mind in believing, or his tongue in speaking, or his pen in writing, that is infallible. But it is neither his Mind, nor Tongue, nor Pen: Therefore he is not infallible.

1. That his mind is not infallible, in point of belief, is confest by the Papiists themselves. One part of them saying he may erre, and the other maintaining that he may be a hereticke, and that many have been so.

That his tongue and pen is not infallible when his understanding erreth is plain.

1. In that otherwise he should be infallible in dissembling, and God is feigned to promise a man to keep his tongue from error when he speaks against his own heart; which cannot be proved, nor soundly imagined.

2. The infallible dictates of the Pope while heereth in mind should be all either unreasonable acts, as being the words of one that knoweth not what he saith, or interpretatively lies. For when a man speaks contrary to his judgement, if his words be true in themselves yet they are interpretatively lys, because he so takes them, and intendeth them as falshoods to deceive others. For instance, If Pope *John* the 23. that was deposed by a General Council upon Articles exhibited against him for denying the Resurrection, and the Life to come, should with his tongue have taught the Resurrection and the Life to come; this had been as lying to him, though the thing it self be most true. And we must have a promise that the Pope of *Rome* and his Clergy, among all the Lyars in the whole world, shall be the onely infallible Lyars. A happy generation of Lyars sure? But where is that promise?

3. It was for the error of the tongue as well as of the mind, that the Clergy desposed *Liberius* & *Felix*, and that the Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance*, and *Basil* deposed the other Popes above mentioned. For 1. they could not know their minds but by their words. 2. They charged them with the errors of their tongues as well as mindes.

Argu. 10. If Popes be infallible in the matters which they understand not, then it must be by Enthusiasm or propheticall inspiration. But all Popes are ignorant of many Divine Truths, and some more notoriously ignorant, and yet neither All nor Any of them (for ought is ever proved) were Prophets, or divinely inspired: therefore they are not infallible.

For the Major its plain, that as no erring man must speak

speak against his own mind, if he be infallible, so an ignorant man (in those points) must 1. either have his ignorance cured suddainly by propheticall inspiration: or else 2. must speak as in an extasie, without or beside his own mind: there being no other way imaginable.

And as for the Minor I prove both parts of it.
 1. That Popes are ignorant of many Divine truths, I prove thus. 1. They that are ignorant of many truths revealed in the Scriptures, are ignorant of many Divine truths: For Scripture being Gods word, all that is therein revealed is Divine truth. But Popes have been ignorant of many things revealed in Scripture: therefore I need not sure stand to prove the Minor, for they confess it themselves. And if the Pope understood all the Scripture, he were sure the most damnable sinner in the world, for not revealing his knowledge to others. 2. Yea some of them have been so notoriously ignorant and unlearned that their own *Alphonſus a Caſtro* saith (*advers. haer. li. 1. c. 4.*) that "[It is certain some Popes be so unlearned, that they do not understand the Grammar.]" And sure if they that understand not any Hebrew or Greek (which are the languages in which the Scripture is written) no nor the Latin Grammar should understand all the Bible and erre in nothing, it must needs be by a Miracle, and by Propheticall inspiration.

2. But that all Popes be not inspired Prophets, nor illuminated by Miracles, I will leave to be judged by the Papists themselves. Read *Platina*, *Stella*, yea or *Baronius* himself, or if they have any other that is a more notorious Parasite to them, and let them be judges.

Argu. 11. If the Pope and his Council be infallible, then it is either in All things that God hath revealed in the Scripture or are necessary to be known, or but in some: If he be infallible in all things necessary to be known, believed, or decided, then will it follow,

1. That the Pope is the most cruelly wicked man on earth, and the greatest enemy to the truth and Church that will suffer the Church to lye in so much ignorance and contention, and will not reveal the truth to reconcile and enlighten them. Why doth he not write an infallible commentary on all the Bible to perfect our knowledge and end all our quarrels? And why doth he not write an infallible summary of all his superadded traditions? Hath not Christ told him that no man lighteth a candle to put it under a Bushel, but where it may be seen of all?

2. Why doth not one Pope reveal that which they think fit to reveal; but leave it to successors one after another to do it by degrees? Dare they say that there is any point of faith revealed in Scripture, and necessary to this age to know, which was not meet to be revealed by the Pope to the last or former age?

3. Why do so many of themselves, yea their General Councils so much contradict their Popes in many things, if he be infallible in all things? And all of them confess that either a Pope, or a Council may erre?

But if it be but some things that the Pope is infallible in, then how shall we be sure which be those some? Can we know before he discloseth them, or only after?

after? I suppose they will say [It is in all those things which he determineth or declareth] But if that be the rule to know the extent of his infallibility by; then 1. Every Pope beginneth to be infallible, when he beginneth to Determine or declare, and not before. 2. And then every Pope increaseth in his infallibility, as he increaseth his Decretals or Canons. 3. And then one Pope is much more infallible then others, who have made more decrees then others. 4. And then some Popes were never infallible, who never made any decrees or determinations or expositions at all, so that their cause is lost, if their actual discoveries be the Rule of the extent of their infallibility. And yet I cannot imagine what else they can say that may have any appearance of consisting with their interest.

For it is either a Positive or a Negative infallibility which they mean and ascribe to their Church. If a Positive, then 1. All the foresaid absurdities unavoidably follow; whether they say that they can infallibly teach us all things (and will not) or but some? But if it be a Negative infallibility which they maintain (*viz.* that the Church shall never teach any false doctrine; Or the Pope shall never deceive us by obtruding any error, though withall he may possibly teach us but part of the truth, yea the *necessary* truth, yea perhaps teach us none at all) I say, if this be their meaning, then every infant or bird or beast hath as glorious a priviledge as the Pope of Rome: For every infant and bruit is so infallible; that we are certain they will not deceive the Church by teaching any error.

Perhaps they'l say that the Pope is positively infallible as a sufficient Teacher of the Church, in all

things *de fide* at that time, or necessary to salvation; and negatively infallible in all the rest, which are not *de fide* or necessary: To which I answer: 1. Either such points are *de fide* and necessary before the Pope declares them so, and he therefore declares them so because they are so: or else he declares them *de fide* and necessary before they are so, that by declaring them so, he may make them so. If the first, 1. then the Papists have lost their cause; for that is which they deny, at least *quoad nos*, though not *in se*, as they use to distinguish. 2. And then it is plain that no Pope hath been positively infallible in *necessariis*, or all points *de fide*: for no one hath declared all, nor are they yet all (say they) declared by them, but every Pope may still add more, and who knows when we shall have all. But if they take the later way, then 1. They suppose that Gods word how express soever doth not make a point to be *de fide* and necessary, till the Pope declare it so (at least *quoad nos*: and how it can be *de fide* and necessary, any other way then *quoad nos*, they should do well to declare: For that which is *credendum*, *est ab aliquo credendum* (that which is to be believed, must be believed by some body) and that which is necessary is necessary to some one.) So that the Gospel shall be no Gospel with them, nor the Law of God any Law, though we read it and hear it a thousand times, till the Pope tell us by parcels the meaning of its particular words and sentences. 2. They make the Popes acts to go before their objects, which is against the nature of actions: while they make him to declare a point to be *de fide* that it may become *de fide*. For to declare that it is so, supposeth that it is so, and not onely that it will or shall be so *de futuro*. 3. And

so they make all the Popes infallible Declarations, Expositions, and Determinations *de fide*, to be Lyes: for if he Declare a thing to be necessary before it is necessary, or declare this or that to be the sense of Scripture, before it is the sense of Scripture, or to be *de fide* before it be so, what is this but plaine lying? But if they say that he declareth it to be *de fide* and necessary onely for the future, and not to have been so before this Declaration, then the forementioned Absurdities fall upon them. And also 1. The Pope is then a Gospel-maker, and the Law-giver of the Church, and that in spirituals and internals; and consequently it is he that is the King of the Church (who hath the Legislative power, and without whom nothing that Christ hath said shall bind us) 2. Then the Churches faith is mutable and in a continual change by new additions: For the Decrees or Expositions of every Pope do make more Artieles of faith then were before. 3. Then the present Papists are not of the same Religion as their fore-fathers (or their fore-fathers not of the same with them) nor do they go to Heaven by the same way: For according to their own doctrine, if the present age of the Church did not believe as *de fide* many things more then the former ages were bound to believe, they cannot be saved. 4. And then it is evident unmercifulness in the Popes of *Rome* to make more Expositions, Decrees or Determinations! and so to make us of this Age, so much work to do before we can get to heaven and scape damnation, which our forefathers never had to do.

* Answer to the Lord Falkland.

I know * one of them reply-
eth to this, that these Addi-
tions are no cruelty, because
they make not salvation more difficult, but fa-
cilitate that which was necessary before (or to
that sence) But 1. It seems then that somewhat
was necessary and *de fide* before the Pope de-
fined, determined or declared them so: By that
time we are plainly told which those points be, the
Papist that undertakes and performeth it, will finde
himself at a sad loss. 2. But is this man serious?
Doth he think indeed that it is not easier to believe
the Apostles Creed, than to believe all that is in the
Councils of *Trent, Basil, Constance, Latirane*, with
all the rest, and all the Decretals (both the Popes
and *Isidore Meccator's alius Peccator*.) For instance,
before the Pope determined the other day, for the
Molmists against some part of the Dominican, Jan-
senian doctrine, both parties might have gone to
heaven: But now the poor Dominicans, must change
part of their doctrine, or go to hell fire. I demand
now whether the Popes determination have not made
salvation harder to many then before? I appeal to
all the Thomists, Dominicans, Jansenians, whether
the Pope hath facilitated their salvation by this deter-
mination? I appeal to *Thom. Whites* friendly combat
with *Francisc. Macedo*; & to the late *Animadversions*
of the *French Doctors* on the Popes determinations.
Further I adde that if all the Popes infallibility Po-
sitive be onely in points of absolute necessity to
salvation, then many a private Doctor, nay every
Christian man or woman, is at present, as infallible as
the Pope: for it implies a contradiction to be a true
Christian, and not to believe all that is essential to
Chri-

Christianity, or absolutely necessary to salvation. And if it be not *de presenti & in sensu composito*, but *de futuro & in sensu diviso* that they mean it, that is, that another man may fall from the faith, but the Pope cannot, 1. Clean contrary, we maintain, and the Papists confess, that no elect person shall fall quite from the faith. 2. But a reprobate Pope may: witness *John* 23. and many another. So much for that Argument.

Argu. 12. If every Pope be infallible (Positively in all matters of faith, or in expounding all Scripture) then all Popes are of equal understanding and fidelity in matters of faith, and Scriptures. For the most learned, wise and pious can go no higher, but to be able infallibly to interpret all Scripture, and declare all Gods will concerning our faith and duty. But sure all Popes are not equal. None of those children or dunces that *Alphonsum a Castro* saith understood not the Grammar, are equal to *Pius* 2. or *Adrian* the 6.

Argu. 13. If every Pope be infallible, then study, learning, consultations, yea and Councils are needless: for the most unlearned Pope is as infallible as the most learned; and after all the study in the world, consultation and advice of General Councils, he can be but infallible; and so, say they he was before. If they say still, that, before he was but negatively infallible; I say again, so is a block, an infant or an idiot. But that studies, learning, consultations and Councils are not needless, I suppose all Papists will grant: therefore they must grant that all Popes are not infallible.

Argu.

Argu. 14. Notorious ungodly men that live in murder, fornication, incest, Sodomy, blasphemy, &c. have no promise from God, nor any other assurance of infallibility: but such were many Popes, Therefore, &c.

The Major I prove from many Scriptures, *2Thess. 2. 10, 11.* *Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved, and for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lye.*] They that receive not the love of the truth that they may be saved, are threatened to be given up to delusions; and therefore have no certainty of being infallible. They that choose their own wayes, God will choose their delusions, *Isa. 64. 4.* There is no communion between light and darkness, Christ and Belial: therefore no infallibility with the children of Belial. Of all men naturally till Christ illuminate them by special grace, it is said in Scripture that they are blind, deceived, lyars, of no understanding, receiving not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. *1 Cor. 2. 14. Prov. 28. 5. Rom 3. 11. Prov. 6. 32. & 9. 4. 10. & 15. 21. & 7. 7. & 12. 11. 2Pet. 1. 9. 2Tim. 3. 13. Tit. 3. 3.* It is onely the elect that cannot be deceived even in the foundation, *Mat. 24. 24.* None of the wicked shall understand but the wise shall understand, *Dan. 12. 10.* They are threatned to be given over to blindness, that they may not understand, *Isa. 6. 9. 10. Act. 28. 26, 27. Mar. 4. 12.* The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, *Psal. 111. 10.* God promiseth to teach the humble *Psal. 25.* but the proud he still resist, when he giveth to the humble his grace, *1Pet. 5. 5. Jam. 4. 6.* And

And not onely the minds of the wicked, but their tongues are deceitful, even when they know the truth, so that a wicked Pope may lye and deceive. *Psal.* 36. 3. *Prov.* 12. 5. *Mar.* 7. 22. *Rom.* 3. 13. I confesse that a wicked man may have some kind of superficial knowledge of all those doctrines (dis-junctly at least) which are known to true Believers; but as he hath no solid knowledge of them, so he hath no promise or assurance of infallibility in that which he is capable of knowing: Nor is it so like that a blind deceitful man should be universally orthodox.

And for the Minor, that many Popes have been notoriously wicked, I need not prove it, while their own Historians and disputers too, do so commonly confesse it. Its well known what wickedness the Councils that deposed them charged upon some, and what poisoning, and other murders, Simony, conjuration, incest, common adulteries and other wickedness, is by the writers of their lives and other Historians charged on so many more, that I should but trouble the weary Reader to no purpose to cite them. Read the lives of Pope *Sylvester* (the Witch) the 2. *Alexander* the 3. and the 6. *John* 13. and the 22. and the 23. *Gregory* the 7. *Urbane* the 7. &c. in *Platina*, *Luiprandus*, *Fasciculus temporum*, *Martinus Polonus*, &c. *Ticinus hist.* li. 6. of * *John* 13. shews that his sins were proved in Council that he ravished and committed filthiness with maids, widows and wives at the Apostolick doors; committed many murders; drunk to the Devil; and at Dice ask't help of *Jupiter* and *Venus*: and at last was slain

* *Vid. Naucley. an. 956.*
sgon. reg. Ita. l. 7. anno. 963.
Anton. Chron. pa 2 ris. 16.
c. 1. 516. Bar. an. 964. n. 17

slain in the act of adultery. See of *Sylvester* 2. *Fascic. temp. an.* 1004. *Martin. Polonus Anno.* 1007. *Platin. in ejus vita.* Of *Boniface* the 7. See *Baronius* himself anno 985. n. 1. Of *Alexander* the 6. see *Guicciardine hist. li.* 1. and *Omniphrius vit. Alex.* 6. But I will name no more.

Argu. 15. Other Bishops and Churches who have as good a pretence to plead for their infallibility as the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, are yet generally acknowledged fallible, even by themselves and by the papists: Therefore the Pope and Church of *Rome* also are fallible.

All that's doubtful is whether any other Churches or Bishops have as fair a plea for infallibility as the *Romane*? which I prove thus.

1. The Plea of the *Romanists* is that their Bishop is the successor of an Apostle who was infallible, and so the Promises belonging to him, do belong also to his successors. And the successors of the rest of the Apostles may have the same plea: For all the Apostles, after the Holy Ghost fell on them, were infallible, as well as *Peter*: And therefore their successors have as fair a plea as *Peters* successors.

Obj. But there was not the like promise made to the rest for their successors stability as was to *Peter*.

Ans. 1. There can no greater a promise to *Peters* successors be shewed, then was made *Mat.* 28. 29. to them all. *Lo I am with you alwayes even to the end of the world.* 2. The Papists (according to their new fundamentals) must not plead Scripture promises for their infallibility; for they say, their infallibility is in order first known, evidenced and to be proved,

before

before it be known that Scripture is Gods word.

2. The plea of the *Romanists* for their Popes infallibility is, that he is the successor of *Peter*. But the Bishop of *Antioch* might as well pretend to be the successor of *Peter*, and yet he pretendeth not to infallibility: Therefore, &c. That History which telleth us that *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, doth tell us that he was Bishop of *Antioch* also; yea and that he was Bishop of *Antioch* before he was Bishop of *Rome*, so that *Antioch* is undoubtedly the ancients Church. What reason then can the Papists give why the Bishop of *Antioch* might not as well plead that he is *Peters* successor, as the Bishop of *Rome*? Unless they could prove that *Peter* did by his last Will and Testament bequeath the honor of succession, and the privileges of infallibility to *Rome* onely; which they have not yet (that I can find) been so bold as to go about to prove. Otherwise, if one must needs be preferred, why should not the eldest, unless they be disinherited, and the younger hath the blessing, which must be proved. Whence is it but from the honor of their Antiquity that *Antioch*, *Hierusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Rome* should be preferred as Patriarchates before all other Churches? And if Antiquity be a good reason for that, then why should not *Jerusalem* and *Antioch* on the same account be preferred before *Rome*, seeing its beyond all doubt that they were both the more ancient Churches, and *Antioch* the more ancient seat of *Peter*, in the judgement of them that make him Bishop of either. So that its clear that other Churches have as much or more to say for infallibility then *Rome*, who yet make no pretence to it.

Argu. 16. The Apostles themselves were not infallible till the holy Ghost fell on them, nor by any other help without the extraordinary inspiration of the Holy Ghost (for before, they understood not that Christ must dye, rise and ascend, till it was done: but *Peter Mat. 16. 20.* dissuadeth him from suffering) therefore the Pope if he might plead succession from *Peter*, cannot expect more then *Peter* himself had; and therefore cannot expect his infallibility without his spirit and inspiration: And therefore those Popes that have not the Holy Ghost, and that inspiration as *Peter* had, cannot pretend to be infallible, as his successors: For they must succeed him in the cause, if they will succeed him in the effects.

Argu. 17. If the Catholike Church be infallible, then the Pope and the Church of *Rome* are not infallible: But the Papists say the Catholike Church is infallible; therefore according to their own doctrine it must follow that the Pope and Church of *Rome* are not infallible.

The argument being *ad hominem* and the Antecedent their own, all the doubt is of the consequence: which I prove thus, either it is the real or representative body which they must call the Catholike Church: But both these are against the Popes infallibility: Therefore.

1. For the real, no man can possibly know all their minds, nor ever expect that they should in this life be all of a minde: therefore it is the Major part that we must have respect to, as its usual in all such

Bodies

Bodies, or Assemblies. Now the greater part of the Catholike Church on earth, is and hath been against the Popes infallibility. That it is so now, is well known, seeing all the Greeks, Abassin, Armenian, Reformed and other Churches are far more then the Papists. 2. And that it hath been so formerly the Papists themselves confess. I will note at this time but one of the most learned and sober of them, *Melch. Canus Loc. Theol. li. 6. cap. 7. fol. (mibi) 201.* "[*Pag-*
natum est siquidem vehementer, non a Gracis solum,
sed ab aliis plerisque totius orbis episcopis ut Romana
Ecclesia privilegium labefacteretur. Atque habebant
pro se illi quidem, & Imperatorum arma, &
Majorem Ecclesiarum numerum: nunquam tamen
efficere potuerunt, ut unius Romani Pontificis potestatem
abrogarent...] That is [Not only the
 "Greeks, but almost all the rest of the Bishops of the whole world, have vehemently sought
 "to destroy the priviledge of the Church of Rome:
 "And indeed they had on their side both the Armes
 "of Emperors and the Greater number of Churches:
 "and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the
 "Power of one Pope of Rome] Mark here that it is
 only success that he pleadeth, but confesseth that most
 of the Bishops of the whole world, and the greater number
 of Churches, besides the Arms of Emperors, were against the
 Romane priviledges, as they call them, & the Popes power.
 So that by this you may see the conscience and modesty of these men,
 that not onely call themselves the whole Church, as if all other besides
 them were some inconsiderable parcels, but also would make the simple people believe that before *Luthers*
time, there were scarce any that denyed their pretended power:
 we may see from themselves then

T

where

where our Church was before *Luther*, so far as Christians opposing the *Romish* usurpations, are our Church, even most of the Churches and Bishops of the whole world by the Papists own confession. And therefore this may stop their mouthes that use to call out to us for a catalogue of their names? would they have the names of *Most of the Bishops and Churches in the whole world?*

2. And then for the Representative Church if there be such a thing it must be a General Council. And I have shewed before, that many such as themselves call General Councils have contradicted the Pope, deposed, and condemned him. This *Ballarmine*, *Canus* and the rest of them do confess, and therefore I need not say more to prove it.

Argu. 18. That General Councils may erre, is proved fully, both by the

*Vid. Baron. tom. 9. an-
no 794. n. 1. Bellarm.
Append. de Imagin. c. 3.*

errors that they have committed, and by their contradicting one another. Its

too well known that the *Arrians* had as General Councils as most ever the Orthodoxe have had, *Ballarmine* and *Canus* give more instances of erring Councils then can be answered by the contrary mind-

*Vid. Bellar. li. 2. de Con-
cil. c. 17.*

ed. Pope *Adrian* and the second Council of *Nice* by him confirmed, decree for adora-

tion of Images: And the Council of *Frankford* determined the contrary, against the said Council of *Nice*, though the Popes Legates contradicted them.

So did the Council of *Paris* anno 825. who examined,

*Leg. Jewell. Defens. Apol.
part 6 c. 17 Divis. 1. &*

part. 1. c. 8. Divis. 1. & part. 2. c. 3. div. 2. & part. 4. c. 18. Divis. 1.

judged

judged and reprehended the Council of *Nice*, and and Pope *Adrians* confirmation and defence of it; and therefore *Bellarmino* saith [*They judged the judge of the whole world*] Their words are recited by *Bellarmino Append. de Imag. c. 3. Baronius anno 825. n. 5.* Its commonly known, how *Nazianzene* complained that [*He never yet saw a Council have a good end, but things were made worse by it and not better.*] And *Hierom* (in *Epist. ad Galat.*) saith [*That is the doctrine of the Holy Ghost which is delivered in the Canonical Scriptures, against which if Councils determine any thing I account it wicked*] Instances of the errors of Councils we have too many. The Council of *Neocesarea*, confirmed by *Leo* the fourth and by the first of *Nice* (as saith the Council of *Florence* *sess. 7.*) condemned second marriages, contrary to Scripture, *1 Cor. 7.* Though *Bellarmino* vainely excuseth them by plaine forcing their words.

Leg. Joh. Reynaldi ibid. 2. pag. 60. 61. ad 68. Lutherus de Conciliis pag. 87 88, 89, 90, etc.

The fourth Council at *Carthage*, forbad Bishops to read the Gentiles Books, which yet the Apostle makes use of, and the Church hath ever since allowed.

The Council of *Toletani*. 1. Ordain that he who instead of a wife hath a Concubine, shall not be kept from the Communion: which *Bellarmino* also falsly excuseth.

The sixth General Council at *Constantinople* hath many errors, which *Bellarmino* confesseth, and layeth the cause on this that they had not the Popes authority: Whereas Pope *Adrian* approved

* *Deft. 16. e sextam synodum & c. habeo librum.*

them *, and the seventh Council judged them genuine:

Adrian saith [*Se sextam synodum cum omnibus canonibus recipere*; he receiveth the sixth Synod with all its Canons and confesseth it to be Divine] The Council at Constance decreed that a General Council is above the Pope: and the Council at the Laterane under Julius 2. and Leo 10. decreed that the Pope is above a General Council *Sess. 11.* The Council of Calcedone abrogated the Acts of the second Council of Ephesus, and decreed the contrary. The Council of Trent, is notoriously erroneous, and contradicteth the Council of Laodicea and Carthag. 3. about the Canon of Scripture. The number of their contradictions and errors is too great for me here to recite. Many of our writers against the Papists give you large Catalogues and full proof of them. See Doctor Surline. li. 2. de Concil. cap. 1. What Gregor. Nazianz. And Hierome say of them, I toucht before: Hilary li. de Synodis exclaimeth against the errors and blasphemies of the Councils of Syrmium and Ancyra: Augustine saith li. 3. cont. Maximni. c. 14. [*Nec ego Nicenum, nec tu debes. Ariminense, tanquam præjudicaturus profere concilium, nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius, detinens*] He saith also lib. 2. de Baptis. [*Concilia plenaria priora, & posterioribus emendari*] That is [Former Councils that were full have been mended by later] Bellarmine deceitful shifting answers to these testimonies, are not worth the repeating. Isidore saith

* *C. Domino. Arist. 50.*

See Andradius Confess.

one of this cont. Maximni. lib. 1.

Quotiescumque in concilio Conciliorum discors

“ *remis*

sentia invenitur, illius concilii sententia maior tenetur, cujus antiquior & potior est autoritas] That is [As oft as we find in the acts of Councils disagreeing judgements, let us hold the judgement of that Council which hath the more Ancient and the greater authority.] But the confession of the adversaries here may spare us more labour, who acknowledge that a General Council though rightly Congregated, and though the Popes Legates concur, may yet erre in the faith, if so be that the Pope doth not approve or confirme their Decrees. So that when they say that [All the Church cannot erre] and therefore a General Council cannot erre; their own meaning is, that one man cannot erre; but All the Church (*viz.* a General Council) without him may erre.

Argu. 19. The infallibility of the Pope or *Romane* Church, was never acknowledged by the Ancient Churches, or Fathers, for six hundred years after Christ: Therefore it is not now to be received.

The Antecedent is so fully proved by our Writers, and so easily discernable by those that read the writings of those times, that there needs not any more to be said. That which I shall produce to this purpose, shall be anon to prove the following point and this together. In the mean time I refer them to Bishop *Jewel*, Chamber, Bishop *Usher*, Doctor *White*, who with many more have fully proved this.

Argu. 20. If the Pope be not the *Authorized* judge of Scripture, nor our faith to be resolved into his judgement (or the judgement of his Church) then is he not the *Infallible* judge of Scripture, and of controversies about matters of faith. For he that is no judge can be no infallible judge: nor doth he need infallibility to qualifie him for a work which he was never called to, nor doth at all belong to him. It is not the Pope as a private Doctor, or as the Bishop of a particular Church, which is made by them the subject of infallibility, but the Pope as the supposed head of the Catholike Church authorized to interpret Scripture, and to judge of all controversies of faith into whose judgement (at least with his Clergy) our faith, they think must be resolved. If therefore we can prove the nullity of the subject we do thereby prove the nullity of the Adjunct. And this leads us up to the third Question, which we have now to deal with.

Quest. 3. Whether our faith must be resolved into the infallibility of the Romane (pretended) Authoritative judgement? Or whether the Popes Authority and infallibility be the thing first to be known, and thence the truth of Scripture or Christian Religion to be received as upon his judgement?

But because this is not the principal point intended in this dispute, and because there is enough said to it in the beginning on the by, and because I have said yet more for explication of the whole matter in the Preface to the later Editions of *The Saints Rest*, I shall

shall therefore say but little to it now, reserving a fuller handling it (if necessary) to a fitter season. Only I shall here adde a few more Reasons to prove that the Pope or *Romane* Church have no such Authority to be judge of Scripture or controversies to all the rest of the Churches on earth; and then I shall adde a few words to prove that we must believe in Christ and receive his doctrine before we believe in the Pope and receive his pretended authority and judgement, that is, without it.

Arg. 1. If the Pope (or his consistory) must be the universal Governor and Judge to all the Christian world, then must the greatest part of the Christian world be ungoverned and have no recourse to their Judge. But the consequent will be denied by themselves: therefore we have reason to deny the Antecedent.

The proof of the consequence is most obvious and certain from the Popes natural incapacity and insufficiency for such a work (and so of his consistory) It is naturally impossible that the Pope should perform the works of this Government to all the Christian world: therefore the consequence is good. He cannot make known his determinations to all: If all men through the Christian world that have such doubts to be resolved as his Holiness supposeth belong to him properly to resolve, should have recourse to him for resolution, O how much would the wayes to *Rome* be beaten and frequented? What a concourse would be about his Holiness doors? What time would he have to resolve those millions of men? If any differences or difficulties arise in *Ethiopia*, or at the

Antipodes; before they go to send to *Rome* for Resolution, and receive an answer, the persons are like to be in another world where they will have a more infallible resolution. And if they live to see the return of their messengers, they must take it on the trust of their words, that this is indeed his Holiness's resolution. Hence it is that *de facto* there is so few people on earth, even of the Papists themselves that are really governed or resolved by the Pope himself, nor know what he is, or what is his minde: but all is done by his Missionaries or Delegates; And if the Pope can delegate his power to others, and make so many others also infallible, then infallibility is not proper to himself: and then why may not the rest of the Bishops of the Church be as infallible, who are sent by Christ, as these are that are sent by him.

Argu. 2. If the Pope be such an universal Governor and Judge, then all Popes must needs be damned for their neglect of the works of their office. For sure when the welfare of the whole Church doth so much depend on the office of the head, it cannot but be damnable in him to be a neglecter of the works of that office to the far greatest part of the Church on earth. But then must needs voidly neglect (I mean omit) that work which it is impossible for him to perform therefore, or it is impossible for him to perform it.

What I have further to say against the desolving of our faith into his judgement shall be contained in these few Questions following.

Quest. 1. Doth he not contradict the very definition of a Pope, that tells us that we must first believe him to be an infallible Pope, before we can believe the Doctrine of Christ? For a *Romane* Pope is supposed to be the Vicar of Christ, the successor of Saint Peter, the head of the Church: And can he be thus known by a man that knoweth not or believeth not that there is a Christ, who is the Saviour and principal head, and who is supposed to send him.

Quest. 2. And doth it not contradict the definition of a Church, to say that we must believe the Church before we can believe the doctrine of Christ? For what is a Church but a Society of Christians, that is, men professing the Christian Faith? And how can they know that such men are Christians, or profess that faith, before they know what that faith is? And how can they know that they are to be credited as Christians, before they believe that Christianity itself is of credit?

Q. 3. Is there any man breathing that can bring sufficient Arguments to prove. 1. That there is a Church of Christ. 2. And that this Church is infallible. 3. And that the Pope and Papists are this Church, before their hearers have received or believed the word of God? If they can, why have they not said closer to work in this necessary point, when they know how much it would do to the determination of the whole? If they pretend such Antecedent proof by miracles, as the Apostles proved the Doctrine by, I have shewed the vanky of this pretence (against *Rom.*) before: and we must still desire them, if it be miracles that is their first witness, to let us see, or have certaine proöfe of those Miracles. We protest to all the world that we are heartily willing

willing to see them and know of them if they be true, but though we have lived in the midst of Papists all our lives, yet could we never to this day see any such matter from them, nor hear so much as of any probable proofs of any. And would they have us in a matter of salvation to believe every prating boaster that will tell us of Miracles and shew us no such thing, nor any proof of them?

Quest. 4. Whether those that do not go this most absurd way (of proving their Church infallible to an infidel that yet believeth not Gods word, and so by means antecedent to the belief of Scripture) must not unavoidably confess that Gods word must be first believed before the Popes or Churches infallibility or authority (and consequently our faith dependeth not in them, nor is resolved into them) or else they are inextricably ensnared in the Popish circle, and contradictorily do make two *primo credenda*, the Church or Pope, the first to be believed, and yet the word of God is first to be believed? And do not Holden, Vane, Knot, and others of them see this, who therefore shun the circle, and use not the old shifts of *Recanum* and others to blind the eyes of those that see them in it?

Whether I wrong them *H. Holden* himself (an Englishman, and Doctor of *Paris*, shall be judge, who thus commendeth his own new devised Foundation or resolution of the faith in his *Divinæ fidei analysis*, l. 1. c. 9. pag. 180. "[*Ex quibus patet hæc Christianæ fidei analysis hand incidere in labyrinthum vulgarem & circulare perperam, quo saltem Theologi passim involvi, qui fidei Resolutionem juxta communem & parum attentè examinatam opinionem construant ac effungunt. Quærenti namque unde*"]

"novum scripturam esse revelatum Dei verbum?
 "Respondent; ex universa consentientis Ecclesia asser-
 "tione. Quibus si iterum fiet interrogatio, unde sci-
 "verint unanimem hanc Ecclesia Catholica assertio-
 "nem esse ab errore liberam seu infallibilem? Re-
 "spondent, ex revelato Dei verbo. Adde ut non au-
 "dentes fidem Divinam in certitudine & evidentia na-
 "turali fundare, in circulum hunc inevitabiliter il-
 "labuntur, & in orbem turpissimo saltantes, fidem,
 "quam ipsa prima ratio format & efficit, rationis ex-
 "pitem reddunt; voluntque homines rationales,
 "mentis ac iudicii participes, in fidei assensu certiores
 "esse, quam vel ratio postulat, vel approbat, Hastitant
 "quippe Theologi quidam asseverare & agnoscere
 "quod omnia argumenta, etiam firmissima, omnesque
 "rationes, item evidentissima, quibus universam fidei
 "Divine & Catholica traditionem solidam erroris
 "immunem & infallibilem esse demonstramus, adeo
 "veritatem hanc evincant, ut nulla prorsus subsit a-
 "berrationis facultas? Ideoque opinantur Christia-
 "norum animos adhuc ita vacillantes & fluctuantes
 "derelictos esse, ut privatum aliquem & singularem
 "infinitum pernecessarium autument, quo omni fi-
 "dei Christiana assensui certitudo & infallibilitas di-
 "vina (at ajunt) attribuat. Nos autem levibus
 "hisce & voluntariis opinionibus fidei divina &
 "Religionis Christiane certitudinem & soliditatem,
 "immo aut fundari, nequaquam judicamus.
 "That is in English "[From hence its evident that
 "this resolution of the Christian faith, doth not fall
 "into the common Labyrinth and circular shift in
 "which Divines are commonly wont to be involved,
 "who do frame and fashion the resolution of faith
 "according to the common and unheedfully ex-
 "

"amined

" amined opinion For when they are asked, how they
 " know then Scripture to be the revealed word of
 " God? they answer, By the assertion of the univer-
 " sal consenting Church? And if they be again asked,
 " how they know that this unanimous assertion of the
 " Catholike Church is free from error or infallible?
 " They answer, By the revealed word of God, so that
 " not daring to found divine faith in natural certain-
 " tainty and evidence, they unavoidably slide into this
 " circle, most filthily dancing in a ring (or round) the
 " faith, which the first reason formeth and effecteth,
 " they make void of Reason, and would have reason-
 " able men who have understanding and judgment, to
 " be more certain in the assent of faith, then reason
 " doth either require or allow. For some Di-
 " vines, &c.] Here you see a Learned Papist
 confessing that the Papists are commonly en-
 tangled in this circle, and filthily dance in a
 round, and would make our faith an unreasonable
 thing. Let *Knos* note this that would make *Chilling-*
worth a *Socinian* and an Infidel for making faith a
 reasonable act. And let the common sort of Papists
 note this that deny faith to have any evidence. And
 let it be considered according to this mans judgement,
 on what foundation the generality of Papists do build
 their faith, and what a faith it is that hath such a foun-
 dation. Yea and let it be considered whether the
 wiser sort of Papists begin not to change the very
 foundation of their Faith? And how neer they
 begin to draw to the Reformed Churches in the
 Resolution of their Faith? For this same Doctor
 doth well. disprove the infallibility of the Pope,
 pag. 179. Saying "[*Omnes quidem Episcopi Ap-*
ostolorum successores sunt, Apostolos vero adu-

"confirmatos in gratia fuisse, ut infallibiles omni-
 "no, seu in doctrina Christiana tradenda ab omni
 "erroris periculo immunes fuerint, agnoscit uni-
 "versa Ecclesia. Nunquid ergo omnes Episcopi ab
 "errore liberi? Omnibus quidem Apostolis re-
 "velata fuisse secreta Caelestia, insque, ut nec
 "decipi nec hallucinari possent; divina & extra-
 "ordinaria via donatum esse certissimum tenemus. Nunc
 "quid ergo vel summo Pontifici vel ceteris Epis-
 "copis hac sunt divinitus concessa privilegia?]
 "That is [All Bishops are the Apostles succes-
 "sors: And that the Apostles were so confirmed
 "in grace, that they were altogether infallible,
 "or free from all danger of error in delivering the
 "Christian doctrine, this the universal Church
 "acknowledgeth. But are all Bishops therefore
 "free from error? We certainly hold that to
 "all the Apostles the heavenly secrets were re-
 "vealed, and that by a Divine and extraordinary
 "way it was given to them, that they could not
 "be deceived or erre. But are these priviled-
 "ges therefore granted to the Pope, or to o-
 "ther Bishops?]

And what is the infallibility that this Do-
 ctor resolveth his Faith into? Let it be obser-
 ved whether it be neerer the Miracles of Knot, or
 to the universal Tradition of *Chillingworth*. Pag.
 174, 175. He hath these words "[Statuendum 2º,
 "juxta supersus stabilita principia, Ecclesia soli-
 "ditatem in fide, seu in fidei divina & Catholi-
 "ca in harendi certitudinem & infallibilitatem,
 "non in privilegio aliquo aut sedis Romanae,
 "Deo auctore, concessio, aut S. Petri successo-
 "ri Pontifici Romanae divinitus impartito, &c.
 "Sed

" *Sed universa & Catholica traditioni Ecclesia specti-*
 " *ali Dei providentia, & Christi Domini promissis*
 " *fuleta, precipue tribuendam esse] & postea [De-*
 " *inde Catholica & universa traditionis rationem om-*
 " *nibus omnino fidei divina dogmatibus pernecessariam*
 " *esse. Traditionis vero medium seu testimonium adeo*
 " *publicum, universale, & apertum esse debere, ut*
 " *sensibus ipsis externis fidelibus omnibus Christianis*
 " *oporteat constare.] That is, The Churches infalli-*
 " *bility and certainty of faith [Is not in any privilege*
 " *either granted by God as the Author to the See of*
 " *of Rome, or bestowed from God on the Pope of*
 " *Rome as Saint Peters successor; but its chiefly to*
 " *be attributed to the tradition of the universal*
 " *and Catholike Church upheld by the special provi-*
 " *dence of God, and the promises of Christ---And*
 " *the account of this Catholike and universal Tradi-*
 " *tion is most necessary to all points of divine faith.*
 " *And the means or Testimony of this Tradition*
 " *must be so publike, universal and open, that it*
 " *must be manifest to all Christians to their very out-*
 " *ward senses.*

I confess this Doctor allows us pretty fair quarter
 in comparison of many others of his party. If they
 will but give us such *Open publike universal certain*
Tradition, which must be known to the very outward
senses of every Christian, we shall be very ready to
 comply with them in receiving such a Testimony.
 But if all the Romish Traditions had been such, they
 would be known to all Christians as well as to the
 Pope, and not lock't up in his Cabinet, and our
 selves should sure have known them before now, if
 we be Christians.

Quest. 5. To proceed, I am very desirous to
 know

know whether it be upon the credit of the present Church (Pope or Council) or of those former that are dead and gone, that we must receive our faith and the Scriptures? Or upon both? If it be on the credit of any former Church, then would I know of which age? whether of the neereſt, or the middle, or of the firſt and remoteſt age, that is, from the Apoſtles and the Church in their dayes? If from the laſt age, then 1. How know we their Teſtimony? If it be by their writings, Canons or Decrees, why cannot other men who are much wiſer and better, underſtand theſe as well as the Pope? And why do they not refer us to thoſe writings, but to their own determinations? If it be by the Fathers telling the children what hath formerly been believed, then, why cannot I tell what my Father told me, without the Pope, and better then the Pope that never knew him? 2. And then it muſt be known upon whoſe credit the former ages did receive that faith and Scripture which they deliver down to us? Doubtleſs they will ſay, from their predeceſſors; and they again from their predeceſſors, and ſo up to the Apoſtles. And why then may not we take it immediately on the credit of the Apoſtles as well as the firſt ages did? ſuppoſing that we have the mediation of a ſure hand to deliver to us their writings, without meditation of the like inſpired propheticall perſons, or of any privileged infallible judge of the faith; And if it be on this Teſtimony of former ages that we muſt receive the Scripture as the word of God, I ſhall then proceed further to demand.

Queſt. 6. Why may not the Greeks, Abaſſines, Proteſtants, &c. that acknowledge not the Popes authority or infallibility, receive the Scripture as the word

word of God, as well as the Papists? Do they think that none else in the world but they can tell what was the judgement of the former Church? What records or Tradition have they which all the rest of the world is ignorant of? Or dare they say (if they have the face of Christians) that none of all the Christians on earth, but Papists onely, have any sufficient evidence that the Scripture was written by the Apostles, and delivered from them, and that this is it which is now in the Church? Can no man indeed but a Papist know the Scripture to be the word of God, upon justifiable grounds?

But if it be on the credit of the present Church (or both) that we must take the Scripture to be Gods word, then I shall further desire to be informed.

Quest. 7. What is it which they call the present Church: Is it 1. The whole number of the faithful. 2. Or a major vote, or part. 3. Or the Bishops, or Presbyters in whole or part. 4. Or a Council chosen from among them, 5. Or the Pope? If the first,

Quest. 8. Do they not then make all Christians infallible as well as the Pope. And so they are in *sensu composito* in the essentials of Christianity and the whole Church shall never deny those essentials, but 1. whole particular Churches may, and 2. the whole Church may erre some smaller errors against the revealed will of God; the Apostle telleth us that we know but in part; and as in many things we offend all, so in many things we err all. And moreover if this be their sense.

Quest. 9. Will it not then follow, that the Pope cannot be proved infallible, because it is most certain that

that All the Church doth not take him to be infallible: no nor the greatest part of Christians in the world. Yea if they will take none for Christians but Papists, yet it will hence follow that there is no certainty that either Pope or Council are infallible. For the *French* take a Pope to be fallible, and the *Italians* and others take a General Council to be fallible: and therefore the whole Popish Church being not agreed of it, we cannot be sure that either of them is infallible. And moreover on this ground I demand,

Quest. 10. How shall we know (in very many cases at least) either which is the judgement of the whole Church or of the major part? What opportunity have we to take the account? Or can no poor Christian believe the word of God, that cannot take an account of this through the world?

The same Question also I would put, if they take all or most of the Pastors for this Church.

Quest. 11. But if they take a General Council for the Church, I would first know, How we shall be sure that ever there hath, at least, these thousand years, been ever a true General Council in the world? The Popish Doctors (as Doctor Holden de Resolus. *fid. li. 1. cap. 9. pag. 156.*) say that [It must arise to that degree of universality that there may not be any suspicion of conspiracies and combined factions, that so every prudent man may be able heartily to say that the Assemblies are truly General.] And is it so, when there are none but the sworn obliged vassals of the Pope of Rome, and the *Greeks, Ethiopians, Protestants, &c.* and most of the Church are absent? and when it is a known combination to promote their own espoused cause?

Quest. 12. And then is the whole foundation of

Divine faith extinct and lost, when there is no General Council? It may be we may have no General Council of a hundred or six hundred, or a thousand years together? Have we no Church then? Or no certainty of Scripture or of the faith? If they say that we are certain by the determinations of former Councils, then they speak of the Church that is past and gone, of which I moved the doubts before: And the Canons of these we can read and understand as well as the Pope: But when we appeal to former Councils and Ages, they would hold us to the present Church, and that must be their own: and so be sure to be judges in their own cause.

Q. 13 I would know also whether it were by the judgment of a General Council that the first Churches believed the Scripture to be Gods word? Did not the Church of *Rome* believe the Epistle to the *Romans*, and the Church of *Corinth* believe the Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and so the rest, to be the word of God, as soon as they received them by an undoubted messenger from *Paul*? Or did they stay till they had the judgement of a General Council or of all the Churches? Indeed they made use of the intervening humane (but certain) testimony, of him that was the messenger or bearer of the Epistle, to know that it was the writing of *Paul* indeed: and so we still maintain the necessity of a credible humane Testimony that these writings came from the Apostles hands: Be *Tychicus*, or *Trophimus*, or *Timothy*, or *Onesimus*, were not a General Council, nor the whole Church. And doubtless those Epistles that were written to each particular Church were received by all the rest of the Churches upon the credit of that particular Church as having received it from an Apostle:

and not that the particular received it from the universal. How did the universal Church know that those Epistles were written by *Paul to Titus, Timothy, Philemon*, to the *Ephesians*, &c. but on the report of the persons and Church to whom they were written? or else of those particular persons or Churches to whom the Apostle did communicate a copy of them.

Quest. 14. And how did all the Church know the Scripture to be Gods word before the Council of *Nice*, when there had been no General Council to determine the business?

Quest. 15. Dare a Papist undertake to justify at Gods judgement all that part of the unbelieving world, for not taking the Scripture for the word of God, who have seen or heard it, and had all other testimonies of it, but never knew of the Testimony of the Pope or a General Council? Shall none of these perish for this unbelief?

Quest. 16. And if it be the Pope that they call the Church, and take it to be this infallible judge, then demand, How knows the Pope that the Scripture is Gods word, or that the Christian Faith is true? The like also I ask of a Council: How doth that Council know it themselves from whom we must know it? Either the Pope and Council must believe it because they first believe themselves, and so take it on their own words, or else on the words of some others. If the former, then they Believe it because they Believe it: then they are the original of their own belief, and believe themselves first, and then would have all the world to believe them. And this is not onely to be so arrogant as to be the God of themselves, and the Church, but also so impudent and unreasonable as

to believe themselves without reason, and to expect that all others should do so too. But if it be not from themselves that the Pope and Council believe the Scriptures, from whom then is it? not from any others of the present Church doubtless, therefore it must be from the former Church: And if so 1. Have not we the same means to know that the former Church believed the Scriptures as the Pope hath, and therefore may believe it without recourse to him, and as infallibly as he? 2. And then it seems that according to their doctrine the Pope and his Council receive not their faith or the Scriptures on the same ground as all the rest of the Church must do: so that the Church must have a twofold foundation of her faith, whereof one is necessary only to one part, and not to the other that is, All the rest of the Church must believe the Scripture to be Gods word, because the present Pope or Council saith so (having first believed the infallibility) but the Pope and Council themselves need not any such ground of their faith? And this distinction is not made between the Laity and the Clergy in general: But even the Clergy themselves out of Council, or who never were of the Council (which sure is more then a hundred for one) must then differ from the Pope and Council in the foundation of their Faith. This is another taste of the famous *Romane* unity: *Paul* saith there is One Faith: but if two divided Foundations, or Reasons of Belief do make two Beliefs, surely the Church of *Rome* hath two.

Quest 17. Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ understood the doctrine of your Papal Authority and infallibility, when he so chid his Apostles for

striving

striving who should be greatest : and telleth them so expressely , that the Kings of the Gentiles exercise Authority over them , and are called , Gracious Lords ; but with you it shall not be so : And when he sets before them a little child , and telleth them that he that will be greatest among them , must be as that child : that is , that humility is the thing that they must strive to be great or excell in , and so to serve one another in love . Also when he commandeth them to call no man on earth Father or Master , that is , of their Faith . Did ever Christ direct the world to go to the Church of *Rome* to know whether he be the Christ , or whether the Scripture be his word or not ?

Quest. 18. Where is the Faith of the Church when the Pope is dead , and when there are three or four at a time , and when there is an interruption by Schisme thirty years together , as it is known there hath been : Hath not the Church then lost her faith by losing the foundation of it ? Or whether then must poor Pagans have recourse to know that Scripture is the Word of God ? If Infallibility survive in other Pastors , then it seemes it is not the Pope onely that is infallible , but others as well as he .

And was not the Churches Faith resolved into the Infallibility of a Woman in Pope *Joanes* dayes ? I know the shifts of *Bellarmino* and *Onuphrius* to make the world believe that the Story of Pope *Joane* is but a Fable : *Florimondus Remondus* is common on this subject .

But the case is out of question thus farre , that we have neer fifty of their own Writers ,

especially old Historians that give us the History of this Pope *Joane*; as *Platina in vit. Joh. S. Sabellicus Enead. l. 1. Antoninus Archbishop of Florence part. 2. li. 16. Chalcondyla li. 6. Mariannus Scotus, Martinus Polonus, Fasciculus Temporum, Nauclerus, Volaterane, Textor. Caryon, Sigebertus Gemblacensis, Mat. Palmerius, Massam, &c.*

And I marvaile why the Papists should be so industrious in refelling it, as if their cause lay more on this then other things. If a Conjuror, a common Whoremonger, a Murderer, a Simonist, a Heretick, may be the infallible judge of the faith, why may not a woman? Hath Christ laid more on the Sex then on all these? specially if she had but kept her self honest, I should have thought *Joane* had been better then *John* the 22. or 23. and many another that yet was of the more worthy gender.

Quest. 19. And further I would know, If the City of *Rome* were consumed with fire, or the Pope-dome removed from that Sea (which *Bellarmin* confesseth, it is not impossible to be done) where then were the infallible head of the Church, and what were become of the Romish faith? If they say that this can never be, and that Christs promise implyeth the preservation of the City of *Rome*. I answer, 1. It will be long before they will give us any proof of that. 2. Their own writers confess the contrary. 3. Let the end determine it. But if they say that infallibility is not tyed to the place, but to the Person, who shall be *Peters* successor, I answer, we thought hitherto that to be *Peters* successor, and to be the Bishop of *Rome*, had been all one with them. If another man that is no Bishop of *Rome* may be *Peters* successor, then how shall we know

know who have succeeded him all this while? Why not the Bishop of *Alexandria*, *Hiernsalem*, *Ephesus*, or other place as well as the Pope? specially why not the Patriarch of *Antioch*, who is said to be the eldest son of Saint *Peter*, as inheriting his first chaire. I doubt, if *Rome* were extinct, and the Bishop of *Mentz*, or *Cullen*, or *Vienna*, or *Rhemes*, or *Paris* or any other should pretend to be the infallible head of the Church, not only the old Patriarchs but their neighbor Bishops would much contradict it; and the world would be at a great loss to find the Popish faith or infallible head.

Quest. 20. Lastly I will appeal to the conscience of any Papist that hath any conscience left, and hath read the Fathers or History of the first Ages of the Church whether the rest of the Bishops and Churches in those times did believe the Scripture upon the credit of the infallibility of the Pope or the *Romane* Church? Did the rest of the Apostles receive the Gospel on the credit of *Peter*, or were they sent by him? or did they receive their authority from him? Do they find that ever the Apostles, or any following Bishops of the Church did take such a course to bring men to the faith, as first to teach them that the *Romane* Pope or Clergy were infallible, and therefore to perswade them to believe the Scriptures or Christian faith, because they say its true. Is it possible that any learned Papists can seriously believe that this was the ancient way of believing? Do they think in good sadness that the world was converted to Christianity by this means? Sure it is scarce possible that they should be so far distracted by their prejudice and faction? Do they read in *Clemens Rom.* or *Alexandrin*, in *Ignatius*, *Iustin*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertul-*
lian,

lian, Origen, Cyprian, or any other of those times, that the preachers that went abroad the world to perswade men to Christianity, did ever use this Popish Medium, or go this way to work? Did they first preach the Pope and *Romane* Church before they preach't Christ or Scripture? Did they first preach men into a belief of the *Romane* infallibility, and then bring them to Christ or to believe the Scripture upon the credit of that? O that these men would but shew us in what history we may find the reports of this way of preaching? Or tell us what parts of the world were converted by this argument?

How many and large Orations, Apologies and other discourses do we find in the Fathers writings for the Christian Faith, to convince the unbelieving world? in *Clem Alexand. Tertullian, Origen, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Minutius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius, Greg Nazianz. Nissen, Athanasius, Basil, Eusebius, Cyril Alexandr. Augustine*, and many others? And can any man of brains imagin that if the infallibility, yea or but the authority of the *Romane* Pope or Church must needs be known before we can believe the Scripture or the Christian faith, and that it must be received upon the credit of that Church, that all these Fathers and others defenders and propagators of the Faith, would have quite forgotten and left out this great and necessary point? What! Would all the preachers and defenders of the faith, overlook and omit the very foundation into which all mens faith must be resolved? Undoubtedly, if this had been then thought to be true which the Papists now teach, we should have had the first part, and a great if not the greatest part of all those Apologies and discourses, laid out in the proof of the *Romane* in-

infallibility. What man will go to evince a whole systeme of doctrines to be true, and quite forget that medium, by which onely it is first to be proved? Would not this have found one place at least if not the chief among *Eusebius* his *Preparations* or *Demonstrations*? Where was there ever in all Antiquity found such an Argument as this to convince an unbeliever? [*Whatsoever the Pope and Church of Rome determineth is true: But they do determine that Scripture is the word of God, or that Christianity is the right Religion: therefore this is true.*]

Nay further consider: If this kind of arguing had been then used, may not any man see that hath not renounced his wits, that the Heathens would have sorely stuck at the Major proposition? and that it would have met with so many objections and contradictions from them, that surely we should have found some of them remembered to posterity. Did *Julian* never stick at this very principle of the faith, the *Romane* infallibility? who stuck at so many things in the faith it self? Or have *Cyrl Alexandr.* and others quite forgot to mention these among the rest of his contradictions? Did it never come into the mind of *Celsus*, *Porphry*, or any other unbeliever that we read of to doubt of and object against this fundamental infallibility? O what an incredible thing is this?

Yea and yet the more incredible will it appear, if you consider, that all the whole cause between the Christians and the Infidels, according to the Popish conceit, must depend upon this one point of their infallibility. For what man will be so mad as to contradict the Church if he once believe that the Church
is

is infallible. Can they think that all the learned Heathens were such fools? It must needs be therefore that their first stop must be at the Major proposition, even at this principle of the Churches infallibility; and therefore certainly their most objections would have been against it, and the most of the Christian Doctors labor would have been in the defending of it: But that its certain they then believed no such thing, and the Church was at that time utterly unacquainted with the foundation of the present *Romish* faith.

Moreover, if this Popish foundation had been then known, do you think that the Fathers would not have appealed to *Rome*, for a decision of all their perplexing controversies? What readier way to have silenced all gain-sayers, and ended all strifes, and to have saved the labor of so many volumes, then to have bestowed their pains with all dissenters upon this one point alone [*That Rome is infallible*] and then have sent them thither for satisfaction in all the rest. Common reason must needs have told men of such principles, that this was the way? But do we find that this way was taken? How come we then to have so many volumes of the Fathers controversial writings, and not one Book, or Chapter, or leaf or line, to prove the *Romane* infallibility?

And because the order of our discourse hath brought us up to the judgement of the Fathers, I shall here give you a brief taste of their judgement in this point, and so conclude this argumentation.

In the contention about *Easter* day between the *Eastern & Western Churches*,

Pellicates with the *Asian* Bellarmin. de Verbo Dei li. 3. s. 6. Baron. an. 198.

Bishops resisted the Popes judicial determination, anno 198. And therefore doubtless they believed not his infallibility nor universal jurisdiction.

In the Council of *Nice*, the first that subscribed, was *Eustathius* Patriarch of *Antioch* before the Legates of the Bishop of *Rome*: *Theodor. li. 1. c. 7.* So did *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* in *Spain*, as *Athanas. Apolog. 2.*

In the Council of *Africk* the Popes Legates had the last place, *Conc. Afric.*

Can. 100. In the Council of Baron. anno 258. n. 15, 16. spondan. Epit. Baron. 5. 199.

Calcedon there was 157. subscribed before *Philip* the Popes Legate. In the fifth Council of *Constantinople*, *Menna* their Bishop was President: *Evagri. l. 4. c. 38.*

And if the Pope had not then so much as the Presidency, how much less an universal jurisdiction with infallibility?

When *Stephen* the Bishop of *Rome* determined judicially against rebaptizing Hereticks, and excommunicated *Firmilianus* for not assenting, and wrote to *Cyprian* about it, what did they do? Did they either submit to the judgement of the Pope as infallible, or obey him as their universal Ruler? No, but *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, with the rest of the Bishops, did unanimously joyn against the Popes decree.

I would fain know by what spectacles the Papists
can

* *Cyprian. Edit. Pamel & Goulart. pag. 239.*

can read these words of * *Cyprians*, to find out their infallibility in them? In his *Epist. 74. ad Pompeium*, he saith thus "[I have sent a Copy of our Brother *Stephens* letters which when you read you will see his error more and more, who endeavoureth to maintain the cause of Hereticks against the Christians, and against the Church of God. For among things which he writeth either proudly or nothing to the purpose, or contrary to himself and ignorantly and unadvisedly, he addeth, &c.] Here mentioning Pope *Stephens* pleading of Tradition, he saith "[Whence is that tradition? Is it from the Authority of the Lord and the Gospel? Comes it from the commands and Epistles of the Apostle? For that we must do those things that are written, God testifieth and propoundeth to *Joshua* saying, Let not this Book of the Law depart out of thy mouth, &c. If therefore it be contained in the Gospel, Epistles or in the Acts, then let this Divine and holy Tradition be observed. --- What obstinacy is this? And what presumption, to prefer Humane Tradition before Divine appointment? and not to consider that God is angry and offended as oft as humane Tradition doth lose or pass by the commands of God. As *Isaiah* saith, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me: in vain do they worship me, teaching the doctrines and commendements of men: and as the Lord in the Gospel reproveth them, Yee reject the commandments of God to establish your Tradition. So *Paul* 1 *Tim.* 6. 3. If any teach otherwise, and rest not in the wholesome words of

our

"our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his doctrine he is
 "proud (or lifted up with stupidity) knowing no-
 "thing, from such we must depart. --- The custome
 "which hath crept in with some, ought not to hin-
 "der the truth from prevailing and overcoming. For
 "custome without Truth, is but antiquity of error,
 "therefore leaving error, let us follow truth. --- It is
 "through a study of presumption and contumacy
 "that a man will rather defend his own wicked and
 "false opinions, than consent to anothers that are
 "right and true: *Paul* therefore saith that a Bishop
 "must be no quarreller, but mild and teachable;
 "for a Bishop must not onely teach, but be taught.--
 "And there is a speedy way for Religious and simple
 "minds to lay down error, and to find and disclose
 "the Truth. For if we re- * That is, the Scrip-
 "turn to * the Head and Ori- tures.
 "ginal of Gods tradition, hu-
 "mane error ceaseth, and whatsoever was in cloudy
 "darkness, it opened in the light of truth. --- If the
 "water Pipes be stopt, do we not run to the foun-
 "tain to see what's the matter. --- So now must the
 "Priests of God that keep his commandement, that
 "if in any point Truth have changed or wavered, we
 "may return to the original, even the Tradition by
 "the Lord, by the Gospel and by the Apostles: and
 "the Reason of our action may rise from thence
 "from whence both order and beginning did arise.]

So far *Cyprian*.

If the Papists can make their followers now believe
 that *Cyprian* believed the Popes infallibility, or that
 the Church of *Rome* was the onely keeper of Tradi-
 tion, or that Traditions were not to be tryed by the
 Scriptures, then you may see to what purpose it is
 that

that they must needs be the judges of Controversie and the sence of Scripture, and why they call it a Nose of wax; even that it may be at their service, and so flexible as to yield to what sence they will put upon it, when they will needs exercise the same Authority on the Fathers themselves who in their familiar Epistles speak as plain as they can.

Firmilianus, a famous Bishop writeth a confutation of Pope *Stephens* Epistle and therefore took him not to be infallible; and he parallell's him with the Ancient Hereticks, *Marcion*, *Apelles*, *Valentinus*, *Basilides*, as bringing in error under pretence of Tradition as they did. And saith "[And for them that are at Rome, they do not in all things observe those things which were delivered from the beginning, and do in vain pretend the Authority of the Apostles; as may be seen in that about *Easter* and about many other Divine mysteries, there are some diversities with them, and they do not equally observe all things as at *Hierusalem* they are observed. As also in many other Provinces many things are varied according to the diversity of places and names, and yet no breach of the Churches unity and peace for this. Which now *Stephen* hath dared to do, breaking the peace with us, which his ancestors kept in love and honor: and moreover defaming *Peter* and *Paul*, as if he had this Tradition from them. --- And in this I have just indignation at the open and manifest foolishness of *Stephen*, that he that thus boasterh of the place of his Bishopricke, and contendeth that he holdeth the succession of *Peter*, upon whom the foundations of the Church are laid, doth bring in many other Rocks and ma-

ketts

" keth new buildings of many Churches while by his
 " authority he defendeth that there is Baptisme ---
 " And as to the confutation of Custome, which they
 " seem to oppose to truth, who is so vain as to pre-
 " fer custome before truth? Or that seeing the light
 " will not forsake the darkness? Except that when
 " Christ, that is the truth, was come, the most an-
 " cient custome would have in any thing helpt the Jews,
 " that leaving the new way of truth, they remained
 " in Antiquity, Which you *Africans* may say against
 " *Stephen*, that having knowledge of the truth you
 " have forsaken the error of custome. But we do
 " both joyn custome to truth, and to the custome of
 " the *Romans*, we oppose custome but of the truth,
 " from the beginning holding that which from Christ
 " and his Apostles was delivered to us. Nor can we
 " remember any beginning of this --- Yea thou art
 " worse then all the hereticks --- See then how igno-
 " rantly thou dardest to reprehend them, who strive
 " for the truth against a lye. For who should more
 " justly be angry with the other? he that defendeth
 " Gods enemies or he that consenteth? But that it is
 " manifest that the ignorant are haughty and angry,
 " while for want of judgement and speech they easily
 " turn to indignation; so that of no man more then
 " of thee doth Gods Scripture say, An haughty
 " man breedeth strife, and an angry man heapeth up
 " sins (*Prov. 29. 22.*) For what strifes and dissensi-
 " ons hast thou made through the Churches of the
 " whole world? And how great a sin hast thou heap-
 " ed on thy self, when thou hast cut off thy self from
 " so many flocks? For thou hast cut off thy self: de-
 " ceive not thy self: For he is truly the schismatick,
 " who maketh himself an apostate from the commu-
 " nion

" nion of Ecclesiastical unity. For while thou think
 " est to suspend all from thy communion, thou dost
 " onely suspend thy self from the communion of all.
 " Can there be one Body and one spirit with such a
 " a man whose soul perhaps is not one, so slippery
 " and mutable and uncertain is it --- And yet is not
 " *Stephen* ashamed to patronize such against the
 " Church, and for the defence of hereticks to divide
 " the brother hood; and also to call *Cyprian* a false
 " Christ, and false Apostle and a deceitful worker;
 " who being conscious that all these were in himself,
 " did by prevention, object all that to another by a
 " lye, which himself deservedly ought to hear] So
 far *Firmilianus*.

The question is not whether *Stephen* of *Rome*, or
 the Eastern Bishops were in the right, but whether
 these passages do not sufficiently declare, that they
 had then no conceits of the Popes infallibility? and
 that when he excommunicated other Churches, they
 took it but as an excommunicating of himself, and
 therefore plainly called him a Schismatick.

In the Council of *Carthage*, 87. Bishops decreed
 expressly against the sentence of the Bishop of *Rome*.
 And *Cyprian* in Council speaks thus "[Let every
 " man speak his judgement, judging no man, nor re-
 " moving any man from the right of communion, that
 " thinks otherwise: For none of us takes himself to be
 " a Bishop of Bishops; or by a tyrannical fear doth
 " compell his Colleagues to obey: seeing every Bi-
 " shop hath by licence free choice of his own liberty
 " and power, and can neither be judged of another,
 " nor can judge another: But let us all expect the
 " judgement of our Lord Jesus Christ, who onely
 " and solely hath power to set us over his Church

" in

in Government, and to judge of our actions.

If this be not as plain as need be spoken against the Papal usurpation, I know not what can be accounted plain.

Yea *Cyprian* and the Council say the like to the Pope himself "[These things

"dear brother we speak *Cyprian. Epist. 72. Edit. Goulartii.*

"to thy conscience for the

"common honor and for simple love----- But we

"know that some men will not lay down that which

"they have once drunk in, nor easily change their

"purpose, but saving the bond of Peace and con-

"cord among Collegues will retain some things of

"their own, which are once grown into use among

"them. Wherein we do neither use violence, nor

"give Laws to any; seeing that every Ruler (or

"Bishop) hath the free arbitration of his own will

"in the administration of the Church, as one that

"must give account of his doings to the Lord.]

If this be not plain still against Papal, and all Archiepiscopal government of Bishops, I know not how a man should speak plain.

The Council of *Carthage* (saith *Gratian Dist. 99*) saith "[Even the Pope of *Rome* must not be called the universal Bishop.]

Gregory called the great Bishop of *Rome*, but a few years before *Boniface* claimed the universal Episcopacy, wrote thus against *John* of *Constantinople* who would have had some such

title "[None of my prede- *Greg. Epist. 80.*

"cessors would use this prophane word (*viz. Uni-*

"versal Bishop) because if one will call himself

"universal Patriarch, the name of Patriarch is stoin

"from others: But far be it from a Christian soul

X

"that

" that any should falsely ascribe to himself that where-
 " by he diminisheth any thing from the honor of his
 " Brethren. To consent to that unjust speech is no
 " other thing then to fall from the faith. One
 " thing we owe to the unity of the faith, and ano-
 " ther to suppress pride. And I say boldly that he
 " who calleth himself *universal Pastor* or desireth so
 " to be called surpasseth the Antichrist in pride...]

So *Epist.* 188. l. 6. He saith "[I have said that
 " he cannot have place with us, if he corrected not
 " the vanity of that superstitious and ambitious
 " word which hath been invented by the first Apo-
 " state. And to speak nothing of the injury done
 " to your honor, if a Bishop be called *universal*,
 " that *universal* once falling the universal Church
 " must also fall.] Here it is especially to be noted
 that this very reason by which *Gregory* condemneth
 universal Episcopacy, is now used by the learned
 Papists to prove the Popes infallibility: For they ar-
 gue that the Pope cannot err *de fide in Cathedra*, be-
 cause else the universal Church should fail with him if
 he fail.

The same *Gregory* in *Epist.* 78. saith "[It is a
 " thing too hard to endure that our Brother and fel-
 " low Bishop, should be alone called Bishop in con-
 " tempt of all the rest: And what other thing doth
 " this arrogancy portend, but that the time of An-
 " tichrist approacheth already, in so far as he imi-
 " tated him who disdaining the company of Angels
 " assayed to ascend to the top of singularity?]

A man would think that all this should be plain-
 enough to resolve us beyond all further doubting, that
 the Popes Universal Episcopacy is new. But to
 this the Papists have no thing to say, but a foolish

pretence that *John* of *Constantinople* would have been the sole Bishop on earth, and have had no Bishop else but himself alone, which the Pope never arrogated, *Ans.* A silly shift, which supposeth all the world to be so unreasonable as to be satisfied with any thing, or else would make them so: A shift that hath not a word of proof to support it, but contradiceth the full course of History, and the words of *Gregory* themselves, which all shew that it was but an universal Episcopacy to which all other should be subject, which *John* of *Constantinople* did challenge; if so much. And all their shew of proof of the contrary is, because *Gregory* here saith that [He would be alone called Bishop] But thats not as if directly in terms, but onely by consequence, he is supposed to lay such a claim, in that he claimed the title of *universal Bishop*. But

Vid. Platin. in vita Gregorii. i.

I now see that the Papists will make a nose of wax of their own Popes Writings as well as of the Scriptures; and that the Pope hath no more the gift of speaking intelligibly than *Peter*, *Paul* or *Christ* himself is by them supposed to have. And therefore what should they talk any more of a living judge, when that living judge himself cannot speak so as to be understood?

Platina saith that "[*Bonifacius tertius a Phocas Imperatore obtinuit, magna tamen contentione, &c.* That *Boniface* the third obtained of *Phocas* the Emperor, but not without great contention, that the seat of the blessed Apostle *Peter* which is the Head of all Churches, should be so called and accounted of all; which place indeed the Church of *Constantinople* did seek to challenge to it self.---]

So that it was the same place or name which the Bishop of *Constantinople* would have had, which *Boniface* after got, and not as *Bellarmino* feigneth, a quite different thing. Nay I cannot perceive any probable evidence that *Boniface* himself had any thought of that Universal Jurisdiction, which now is arrogated, but onely to be the Greatest and Highest of all Bishops, and in that sence called the Head or the universal Bishop.

If they knew the Pope to be the supreme infallible head of all the Church, why did the Council of *Calcedon* (the fifth general Council)

Vid. Binnium Tom. 2. Conc. part 1. art. 4. Conc. Calced. p. 218. & part. 2. Art. Conc. gene. 3. Collat. 6. p. 101. & Collat. 8. p. 113. Vid. Constitut. Vigil. in Binnium Tom. 2. part. 2. p. 25, 26. & Baron. anno. 553.

examin *Leo's* Epistle, and profess to receive it onely on its agreement with former doctrine? Yea why did this Council condemne Pope *Vigilius* his^e judicious sentence *de 3 capitulis*? Yea and anathematize all that condemned

not *Theodorus*, of whom *Vigilius* was one? and this in a Doctrinal Point, Whether Hereticks may be condemned after death? Yea they pronounce the Pope and his adherents defenders of impiety, and such as cared not for Gods decrees, or the Apostles pronunciations, or the Fathers Traditions. If these 165. Bishops had believed the Popes infallibility, they would rather have craved his Definitive sentence. And why did the Council of *Calcedon* also Decree without the Popes consent, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* was equal with him; and the 5-sixth general Council confirm it?

Any man of understanding that readeth over the Decretals of the several Popes shall find besides all other

other errors, so many false expositions of Scripture, even common reason, and the Papists themselves being judges, that there needs no other proof that they are too fallible.

Augustine in l. 2. Contr. Donatist. li. 2. Contr. Donatist c. 3. de Bapt. pag. Edit. Paris 40.

Donatist. saith "[Ipsa con-

cilia qua per singulas regi-

ones, &c. That is, Who knoweth not that the very

Councils themselves which are held in several Re-

gions or Provinces, do without more ado yield to

the authority of fuller Councils which are made out

of the whole Christian world? And that the

full Councils themselves which were before are

*oft * mended by the later, * Or Corrected.*

when by some experiment

of matters that is opened which before was shut up,

and that is known which lay hid, and this without

any smock of sacrilegious pride, without any infla-

tion of arrogancy, without any contention of livid

envy, with holy humility, with Catholike peace,

with Christian charity.]

This he brings as *a maiore* to shew the Donatists

the invalidity of *Cyprians* authority, telling them

that it is the holy Scriptures that are undoubted

and of unquestionable credit, but not the writings

of any Bishops since, no nor of Councils them-

selves.

This place of *Ausindoth* confirm the *French Pa-*

pists as well as the *Italian*, that they have nothing to

say against it, that without meer impudency can be

thought to be of any weight. What is vainly said

by them, you may see answered in *A. B. Land's*

Book against *Fisher* and *A. C. Pag. 240, 241,*

242.

In *Austines* Book against *Petilianus* the Donatist the very question debated, is, How they may know where the true Church is? And is it not a wonder that *Austin* never remembered to direct them to *Rome*, or to the Popes infallibility, if that had been the approved way? Here then what way *Austin* went

August. Cont. Petil. Don. Cap. 2. pag. (*ubi Edit.* Paris) 141. "*Quaestio certe*
c. 2. & 3. "*inter nos versatur, ubi sit*

"*Ecclesia? utrum apud nos, an apud illos? -- Quid*
"*ergo facturi sumus? in verbis nostris eam quaerimus,*
"*an in verbis capitis sui Domini nostri Jesu Christi:*
"*& puto quod in illis, &c.* that is, The question hand-
led between us is where is the Church? with
us or with them? What must we do then? must
we seek it in our words, or in the words of our Lord
Jesus Christ our head? I think in his who is truth
it self, and best knows his own body, *1 Tim. 3.* The
Lord knoweth who are his.] Cap. 3. p. 142. "*Sed*
"*ut dicere caperem, non audiamus, hac dico, hac dicis,*
"*sed audiamus, hac dicit dominus, &c.* That is, But
as I began to say, Let us not hear, I say this, and
you say that, but let us hear, Thus saith the Lord.
There are certainly the Lords Books, to whose au-
thority we both consent, we both believe them, we
both obey them; there let us seek the Church,
there let us discuss our cause. --- *Auferantur, ergo*
"*illa de medio, &c.* Away with those things from a-
mong us, which we bring against one another,
not out of the Divine Canonical Books, but from
elsewhere --- *Quia nolo humanis documentis, &c.* Be-
cause I will not have the holy Church to be de-
monstrated by humane documents, but by Gods
Oracles. For if the holy Scriptures have placed
the

"the Church in *Africa* alone, and in a few places of
 " *Rome*, &c. then whatsoever may be brought out of
 " other papers, the Church is onely with the Do-
 " natists. *Si autem*, &c. But if the Church of
 " Christ is placed by the Divine and most certain
 " testimonies of the Canonical Scriptures in all Nati-
 " ons; then what ever they bring, and whence
 " ever they recite it, who say, Lo here is Christ, or
 " lo there; let us rather, if we be his sheep hear the
 " voice of our Shepherd, saying, Believe them not.
 " For those parcels are not found in many Nations,
 " where that (Church) is: but it, which is every
 " where, is found even where they are; therefore
 " let us seek it in the holy Canonical Scrip-
 " tures.]

And thus he goes on and proves at large by the
 Scriptures the true Church; fitting all as meet to the
 present schisme of the Papists, almost as if he had
 seen and named it.

Cap. 18. Begins thus "[Because therefore the
 " holy Church is manifestly known in the Scriptures,
 " &c.] *Remotus ergo omnibus*, &c. Laying aside
 " therefore all such matters, let them demonstrate
 " their Church if they can; not in the speeches
 " and rumors of the *Africans*, not in the Councils
 " of their Bishops, not in the writings of any dis-
 " puters, not in signes and fallacious Miracles, be-
 " cause we are prepared and cautioned against such
 " things by the word of
 " God: but in the writings

Cap. 18.

" of the Law, in the predictions of the prophets, in
 " the Psalms, in the words of our Pastor himself, in
 " the preachings and labors of the Evangelists, that
 " is, in all the Canonical authorities of the sacred
 " Books.]

Next he shews that it must not be out of Parables, Allegories or such Scriptures that make no more for one side then the other (what then? doth he tell them that it is all such, and send them to *Rome* to know the sence? no) but it is the plain Scripture of which he produceth abundance that must tell us which is the true Church. And he thus begins the 19 Chap.

* *Omissis ergo, &c.* Letting pass therefore the snares

Cap. 19. pag. 154.

" of delays let him shew

" their Church, &c. and so

" shew it, as not to say, Its true, because I say it, or

" because my colleague said it, or these colleagues of

" mine, or those Bishops, or Clerks, or our Layity,

" or therefore its true * be-

* How fit is this wedge for Master *Knot* if he will but apply it, it may easily cleave his new foundation of the faith.

" cause these or those won-

" ders were done by *Donatus*

" or *Pontius*, or any other,

" or because men pray and

" are heard at the Memories

" (or shrines) of ours that are dead, or because

" such or such things happen there, or because that

" brother of ours, or that sister of ours saw such a

" sight waking, or had such a dreaming vision sleep-

" ing. Away with these either fictions of lying

" men, or wonders of deceiving spirits: For either the

" things that are said, are not true, or if any wonders

" are done by hereticks, we must the more beware,

" seeing the Lord when he told us there would come

" deceivers, who by doing certain signs would deceive

" if it were possible, even the elect, addeth, Lo I

" have foretold you, - And if any be heard praying

" at the Memories of hereticks, it is not for the

" desert of the place, but the desert of his desire

that

"that he receiveth good or evil. 2- No man can have
 "Christ for his head, that is not in his Body, which
 "is the Church: which (Church) we must know as
 "we do Christ himself in the sacred Canonical Scrip-
 "tures, and not to inquire into the various rumors
 "of men and their opinions, and deeds, and sayings,
 "and sights. --- But let them shew me whether they
 "have the Church, no way but by the Canonical
 "books of the divine Scriptuers: Because neither do
 "we therefore say, that they ought to believe us that
 "we are in the Church of Christ, because that
 "(Church) which we hold is commended by *Optatus*
 "*Milevitanus*, or by *Ambrose* of *Millan*, or in-
 "numerable other * Bishops
 "of our communion, or be-
 "cause it is predicated (or
 "praised) by the Councils of
 "our Collegues, or because
 "through the whole world in the holy places which
 "are frequented by our communion, so great mar-
 "vails of hearings, or healings are done (here some
 "are named.) What ever things of this sort are done
 "in the Catholike Church, are therefore to be
 "approved, because they are done in the Ca-
 "tholike Church, but it is not therefore manifested
 "to be the Catholike Church, because these things
 "are done in it. --- This he testifieth is written in the
 "Law and the Prophets and Psalms; this we have
 "commended by his own mouth. These are the do-
 "cuments of our cause, these are its foundati-
 "ons, these its upholders (or confirmers.) We
 "read in the Acts of the Apostles of some Be-
 "lievers, that they daily search't the Scriptures
 "whether those things were so: What Scriptures?
 But

* Was the Pope of Rome
 none of these innumer-
 able Bishops of the
 Church?

“but the Canonical of the Law and prophets? Here-
 “to are added the Gospels, the Epistles of the Apo-
 “stles, the Acts of the Apostles and the Revelation
 “of *John*. Search all these, and produce somewhat
 “manifest which will demonstrate that the Church

* Or *Rome*.

“either * remaineth in *As-*
 “*rick* alone, or is to be from

“*Africk*, so that it may be fulfilled which the Lord
 “saith, This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be pre-
 “ached in all the world, &c. But bring somewhat that
 “needeth not an interpreter, that you may not be
 “convinced that it speaks of another matter, and that

“you strive to turn it to your
 “own sense * ---] Chap. 25.

* Like the Papists, *Pasce*
ovis meas : Et tu es Pa-
trus, &c.

“[The question is not dark
 “in which they may deceive

“you--- You see the Church is every where diffused,
 “and increaseth to the harvest.]

This whole Book of *Austin* is written, as if it had
 been purposed as a confutation of the Papists that
 will have the Church to contain onely the *Romane*
 fiction, and exclude all the rest of the world, and
 will try the Scripture by the Church, and not the
 Church by the Scripture, but fly to I know not what
 visions and pretended miracles to prove their
 Church which *Austin* professeth are not a proof no
 not of the true Church, though there be much more
 then there to boast of : so that the Papists cannot
 here say that *Austin* thus dealeth with the Donatists,
 because they denyed the Church of *Rome* and believ-
 ed the Scripture : he expressly enough preventeth all
 such expositions of his words.

August. Cont. Crescon li. 2.
 c. 33.

August. con. Cresconium li.
 2. cap. 33. p. 177. Saith

“[Ego

[*Ego hujus Epistola, &c.* I am not bound by the authority of this Epistle (of *Cyprianus ad Jubai* :) because I take not *Cyprianus* Epistles to be Canonical, but by the Canonical I consider them, and that in them which agreeth to the authority of the Divine Scriptures, I accept with his praise, but that which disagreeeth I refuse with his peace. And so if thou hadst recited those things which he wrote to *Jubajan* out of some Canonical book of the Apostles or Prophets, I should have had nothing at all to gain-say : But now, seeing what thou recitest is not Canonical, by that liberty to which the Lord hath called us, I refuse it, &c.] And he compareth it to *Peters* compelling the Gentiles to Judaize *Gal. 2.* shewing that even *Peter* should have been so refused in error.

The words of *Austin* in *Epist. 19. ad Hieron.* are commonly cited " [I have learned to give onely to

August. ad Hieron. Ep. 19.

those writings which are now called Canonical, this reverence and honor, as that I dare say, that none of them erred in writing: but others I so read, that how holy and learned soever they be, I do not therefore think it true, because they so judged, but because they persuade me either by those Canonical books or by probable reason that they say true.]

As commonly cited is that *li. 3. Cont. Maximin. Arrianic. 14. pag. (mibi) 306.*

" [*Sed nunc nec ego, &c.* But now neither ought I as fore-judging (or for pre-judice) to bring forth the *Nicene* Council, nor thou the Council of *Arimini-*

August. cont. Maximin. l. 2. c. 14.

Vid. etiam August. in Psal. 21. exposit. 2.

" *num,*

" *nam* ; I am not bound by the authority of this
 " thou of that. Let matter contend with matter, cause
 " with cause, reason with reason, by the authorities
 " of the Scriptures, which are witnesses, not proper to
 " either of us, but common to both.]

It were too long to recite the fourtieth part which
Augustine hath to this purpose. He that would see
 more, let him read his *Epist.* 112. & *de Morib. Eccles.*
Cathol. c. 7. & *Epist.* 111. & *Contr. Faustum* li. 11. s. 5
 & *de Trinitat.* li. 3. &c.

The words of *Optatus lib. 5. advers. Parmen.* are
 frequently cited by our writers : which are thus

Optatus li. 5. *advers. Parmen.* "[*Querendissimi judices*, &c.
 " We must seek judges. If
 " Christians, they cannot be
 " admitted on either side, because by siding the truth
 " is hindered. We must seek a judge abroad (or
 " without.) If a Pagan, he cannot know the Chri-
 " stians secrets. If a Jew, he is an enemy to the
 " Christian Baptism. On earth there can no judg-
 " ment of this matter be found. We must seek a
 " Judge from heaven. But wherefore should we go
 " knock at heaven, when we have it here in the Gos-
 " pel? A Testament (I say, because here we may well
 " compare earthly things to heavenly) is such, as
 " that a man that hath many sons, doth command

Vid. A. B. *Land* against
Fisher. and A. C. pag 194.
 vindicating this.

" them all himself as long as
 " the father is present: there
 " is then no need of a Testa-
 " ment. So Christ, as long as
 " he was present on earth (though yet he be not wan-
 " ting or absent) commanded the Apostles whatever
 " was needful, for the time. But as a father when
 " he seeleth himself neer to death, fearing lest after
 his

his death, the Brethren should unpeaceably quarrel, doth before witness put his Will out of his dying brest into writings which may endure. And if there shall rise any contention among the Brethren, they go not to the Grave, but seek the Testament; and he that resteth in the Grave doth silently speak by the writings. The Living (Lord) whose the Testament is, is in heaven. Let his will therefore be sought in the Gospel, as in a Testament.]

The Author of the imperfect work on *Mat.* commonly imputed to *Chrysostome Homil.* 49. saith

[At this time, since heresie hath possessed these Churches, there can be no proof

Opus imperfect. in Math. Hom. 29.

of true Christianity, nor any other refuge of Christians, that would know the truth of Belief, but the Divine Scriptures. For before it was declared by many means, which was the Church of Christ, and which was Gentilism. But now it is by no way known to them that would know, which is the true Church of Christ, but only by the Scriptures. --- How therefore should he that would know which is the true Church of Christ, come to know it, but onely by the Scriptures?]

One would think this were plain enough, if the Papists were not the Judges of the meaning of all writings, as well as the holy Scriptures, which condemne their cause?

*Junilins ad Primas, li. 2.
qu. 29.*

*Junilins ad Primasium
part. divin. legis li. 2. qu. 29.*

Saith [Unde probandum]

“*bros, &c.* How do we prove that the Books of our
“Religion are written by Divine inspiration? Many
“wayes, of which the first is the truth of Scripture
“it self, then the order of things; the agreement of
“precepts, the manner of speech without affecta-
“tion (or compasses) and the purity of words; There
“is added also, the quality of the writers and prea-
“chers; that meer men could not have delivered
“such Divine things, and vile men such high things,
“and uneloquent men such subtle things, unless they
“were filled with the Holy Ghost. And the force of
“the preaching of it, which it had when it was prea-
“ched, though by a few contemned men. Hereto is
“added the witness of the contrary party, as the
“Sybils or Philosophers: the expulsion of adver-
“saries; the utility of the consequents, the events
“which by acceptations and figures and predictions
“were foretold: and lastly the Miracles, which were
“continually wrought till the Scripture it self was re-
“ceived by the Nations: of which this sufficeth for
“the next Miracle that it is known to be received by
“all.]

Saith *Chamier* citing this passage, Here are argu-
ments enough to prove the
authority of Scripture, inter-
nal and external; but no
mention of the Churches antecedent judgement to
determine it. The same may be said of *Ensebinus*,
Austin and the rest that prove the Scripture and
Christian Religion.

Hieromes words are frequently cited on Math. 23.

"[*Hoc quia de Scripturis,*

Hierom. in. Math. 23.

"&c. This is as easily con-

"temned as proved, because it hath not authority
"from the Scriptures.] And on *Isaiah 8.* He saith

"[*Si de aliquo dubitatis, &c.*

*Hierom. in Isa. 8. fol. (mi-
bi) 18.*

"If you doubt of any thing

"know what is written ---

"If you would know the things that are doubt-
"ful, rather give up your selves to the law and to the
"testimonies of the Scriptures.] And on the 86.

Psal. He saith "[*Quam-*

*Idem in Psal. 86. Idem E-
pist. ad Rusticum, Idem ad
Evagr.*

"vis sanctus aliquis, &c.

"Though there be some

"Saint after the Apostles ne-

"ver so eloquent, yet he hath not authority.] And

Epist. ad Rustic. "[Since covetousness entered into

"the Church as into the Empire, the Law is perish-

"ed from the Priests, and the vision from the Pro-

"phets.]

And the same *Hierome Epist. ad Evagr. (fol. 150.*

Edit. Basil. per Froben, 1516. Tomo. 3. & pag. 329.

Edit. Basil. 1536. Tomo. 2.) Saith thus "[*Quid*

"enim facit excepta ordinatione Episcopus, quod pres-

"byter non faciat? Nec altera Romana urbis Eccle-

"sia, altera totius orbis existimanda est: Et Gallia,

"& Britannia, & Africa,

"& Persis, & Oriens, & India

Erasmus in his first Anno-

tations saith that [hac olim

sortasse vera. nunc magna ex parte commutata sunt, viz. Quod a-

qua Eugubiensem Episcopum cum Romano, nec putat ullum Episco-

pum alio majorem esse nisi quatenus superat humilitate, & non putat.

Episcopum quovis sacerdote prestantiorem esse, nisi quod jus habet or-

dinandi.] But in his latter Annotations he merrily referreth all

the equality in their respect to the Deacons, that he might

seem to abate the offence.

"*OVINES*

" omnes *Barbara nationes*, unum *Christum* adorant,
 " unam observant regulam veritatis. Si *Authoritas*
 " quaritur, *Orbis* major est *Urbe*. *Ubi* cunque fuerit
 " *Episcopus*, sive *Rome*, sive *Eugubii*, sive *Constanti-*
 " *nopoli* sive *Rhegii*, sive *Alexandria* sive *Tanis*, ejus-
 " dem meriti, ejusdem est & sacerdotii. *Potentia* di-
 " vitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimior:
 " em vel inferiorem *Episcopum* non facit. *Ceterum*
 " omnes *Apostolorum* successores sunt. Sed dicu-
 " Quomodo *Rome* ad testimonium *Diaconi* presbyter
 " ordinatur? Quid mihi proferis unius urbis consue-
 " tudinem? Quid paucitatem, de qua ortum est su-
 " percilium in *leges Ecclesie* vindicas?] That is [For
 " what doth a Bishop except ordination which a
 " Presbyter may not do? Nor is the Church of the Ro-
 " mane City to be esteemed one and the Church of the
 " whole world another: Both *France*, and *Brittain*,
 " and *Africk*, and *Persia*, and the *East*, and *India*,
 " and all the Barbarous Nations do worship one
 " Christ, and observe one Rule of truth. If you seek
 " for Authority, the world is greater than the Ci-
 " ties (of *Rome*) Wherever there is a Bishop, whe-
 " ther at *Rome*, or at *Eugubium*, or at *Constanti-*
 " *nople*, or at *Rhegium*, at *Alexandria* or at *Ta-*
 " *nis*, of the same Merit, he is also of the
 " same Priesthood. The Power of riches, and
 " the lowness of poverty, make not a Bishop high-
 " er or lower: But they are all the Apostles succes-

Baronius ad Tom. 402.
pag. (mibi) 160 To. 5.
et ita Tom. 1. Doth in
vain seek to avoid the
force of this passage, as if
the equality were only quoad sacros ordines. It seems the Popes
jurisdiction is no part of his office, nor belongeth to him by
ordred orders.

" sors. But you say, How
 " is it that at *Rome* a Presby-
 " ter is ordained on the testi-
 " mony of a Deacon? What

"tell you me of the custome of one City? why do you
 "defend a few (of which superciliousness is arisen)
 "against the Laws of the Church ?]

It may be the Papists by their ~~Ex~~perminent power
 of interpreting all Church writers, can put such a
 sence on these words of *Hierom*, as shall consist with
 that which he purposely doth oppose : But I think an
 impartial man can hardly believe that when he wrote
 these words, he was acquainted with *Romes* claim of
 universal jurisdiction and infallibility.

Nay when it is the scope of much of the former
 part of this Epistle to prove the equality of Bishops
 and Presbyters, in the beginning, and that at that
 time they differed in no power but that of ordaining
 (when yet he saith the Presbyters of *Alexandria* did
 long make their own Bishops) how then could *Hie-*
rome believe the Popes universal jurisdiction ? Could
 he think that the Bishop of *Rome* had that power o-
 ver the Church which he thought not any Bishop
 to have over the Presbyters of any one Church ?

Greg. Nazianzene saith of Councils " [If I must

"write the truth, I am of

"this mind, that I will flye

*Nazianzene Bellar. li. 2. de
 concil. c. 7. pag (mibi) 121.*

"or avoid all Councils of

"Bishops : for I never saw a glad or happy end of

"any Councils, or which did not rather bring an ad-

"dition or increase of evils, then a removal of them.]

To this of *Nazianzene Bellarmine* answereth that

[*Gregory* meant that in his time no Council could be

wholly lawful : for he lived between the first and se-

cond general Council, where he had seen many

Councils which because of the great number of He-

reticks had a bad end.] And he names five of

them.

Y

Ans.

Answ. 1. But by what Authority doth *Bellarmino* confine *Gregories* words to some Councils, which he speaks in general of all that he had seen or might do resolving to avoid all hereafter. 2. Here note that *Bellarmino* confesseth that Councils may erre; and then where is the *French* Religion? 3. I would fain know where was the Churches infallibility, and power of judging of matters of faith in *Nazianzens* dayes? If there were no lawful General Councils, nor could be, then it was not in them; therefore it must be either in the people (and how shall we gather the world together to consult with them) or else as *Bellarmino* will say, in the Pope alone, or in the *Romane* Clergy with him. I hear not yet that they

Why did *Nazianz.* never remember, when Councils all failed, and the Pope was the onely living fallible judge, to have pleaded this with the Hereticks, and to have sent them all to *Rome* instead of the Councils.

are very forward to prove that the *Romane* Clergy in particular are Infallible (though *Bellarmino* hath given us his bold conjectures of that) It must needs be therefore that at that time all the Churches infallible judicial power, and so the foundation of our faith must

be resolved into the Pope alone; and so the faith of all the world must then be resolved into the credit of the word of a single and silly man. I know the *Italian* faction will not abhor this at any time; but then they should for shame speak out and deal plainly with the world, and not talk of the whole Church and all the Church, when they mean but one man. 4. And I would fain know of any friend of *Bellarmines*, how far the universal

Church

Church was visible at that time, when all Councils were bad, and none could be lawful? The visibility was not in a Council to represent the whole: and the Laity are not much noted when Councils go wrong, so that the Church was visible onely in one man, or a few particular persons, according to the Papists' common reckoning, who judge by the Pastors visibility: Yea the Church of Rome it self was invisible when and divers times when their Bishop was a Heretick. If therefore they will say either that the Church was visible in one man, or in the Laity of many partes oppressed by the Clergy and Magistracy (and they have nothing more to say) then we will say as much of the visibility of our Church before Luther, and more too. 5. Its confesseth here also that not onely a Council, but the greater number (by very many) of the Bishops of the Church may be heretickes or erre in faith. 6. And then the Church may lye in the smaller oppressed part: and why then may not the most erre now?

Stapleton himself confesseth that Luther was not much out of the way, when he said, there were scarce five Bishops

* Stapleton de princip. doctrin. li. 2. cap. 18. Hieron. Dialog. advers. Lucifer.

to be found that turned not Arrians. And Hierome saith Dialog. advers. Lucifer.) [The whole world remained, and wondred that it was turned Arrian.] And did the authority of the Scripture at that time fall quoad nos, when the judge was turned heretick? even *Liberism* and the Councils?

And if the high Elogies of the *Romane* Church would prove its Authority, then see what *Nazianzene*, saith of the Church of *Casarea*. In his 22. Epistle ad *Casarienses patris nomine scripta* (found a-

Greg. Nazianzen. Epist. 22.
To. 1. p. 85.

mong his own works, Edit.
Paris. Tom. 1. pag. 785. and
also in *Basil's* works transla-

ted by *Musculm Edit. Basil. 1565. Tom. 2. pag. 17.*

"[Seeing every Church as being Christs body is to
"be watched over (or looked to) with greatest
"care and diligence, then specially yours, which an-
"ciently was, and now is and is esteemed, almost (or
"nigh) the mother of all Churches, on which the
"whole Christian Commonwealth doth cast their
"eyes even as the encompassing circle doth on the
"center, not onely for the soundness of doctrine
"long divulged to all, but also for that conspicuous
"grace of Concord which God hath given them..

What would the Papists say, but that this were for
their supremacy, if they found but this much in him
for the Church of *Rome*.

And I think there is no doubt but that in those
ancient times the Church was acquainted with the
true way of Government as well as *Rome* is now
and therefore I would know further. 8. Whether the
truest Government may not stand with great desola-
tions, divisions of the Church and multitudes of er-
rors? *Greg. Nazianzene saith (Orat. 20 pag. 345.)*

That when *Basil* se-
upon the great work of heal-
ing the Church "[The holy Nation, the King-
"Priesthood was so far amiss that it was distracted in
"to six hundred opinions and errors; And spoiled
"and wasted by the Devil.] If the Popes Monar-
chical Government was then a foot, then it seems
that Government will no more prevent sects and er-
rors then the worst: If it were not, then 1. They
are now usurpers, 1. And they cannot prove our

way of Government to be wrong by the multitude of errors that are in the Church.

Basil was far from resolving his faith into the Popes infallibility when he wrot his *Asctica* (or at least *Eustathius Sebastienus*, if they be his) when (pag. 195. *Tom. Basil, Mag. To. 2. Ascet. p. 197.* 2. *translat. Musculi, Basil*)

he saith "[It is a manifest lapse of faith, and apparent vice of pride, either to refuse any thing which the Scripture containeth, or to bring in any thing which is not written : seeing Christ saith, *My sheep hear my voice*, and premiseth, But another they will not follow, but flye from him, because they know not a strangers voice.] And pag. 193. he saith, that sometimes he had used unwritten sayings against hereticks "[But never aliene from the Scripture sence, &c.] and that now he was resolved "[To make use of what he had learned from Scripture, and but sparingly, to use the very names and words which are not literally conform to the divine Scripture, though they do contain the Scripture sence.] The same *Basil Epist.*

80. *To. 2. p. mibi. 74. renouncing the argument from custome*, saith "[Let us

Basil To. 2. Epist. 80. ad Eustathium Medicum.

stand therefore to the arbitration of the Scriptures inspired from God : and with whomsoever is found the opinions which are agreeable to the Divine oracles, to him let the sence (or sentence) of truth be wholly adjudged.] This is *Basil's* judgement of the judge of controversies.

Hilarinus Pictav. in his *E.*

Hilarinus Pictav. Edit.

Paris. 1531. pag. 318, &c. Idem de Trinit. li. 2. p. 16. Idem in Mat. p. 498.

pistle de Synodis adversus Arrianos pag. (mibi) 318.
 319. and fully sheweth his thoughts that Councils
 have erred, and that even those of the Orthodox
 are to be tryed by the Apostolical doctrine. And
lib. 2. de Trinitate pag. 16. col. 2. he saith "[Commen-
 " *dat autem fidei hujus integritatem, &c.* The integri-
 " ty of this faith is commended by the Authority of
 " the Gospel and Apostolical doctrine --- For this
 " foundation standeth strong and unmoved, &c.]
 And he maketh it a remedy against all Here-
 lies.

And in his Commentary on *Mat. Canon. 8. pag.*
 498. he saith "[*Igitur secundum hac Ecclesia intra*
 " *quas verbum Dei non vigilaverit, naufraga sunt,*
 " &c. i. e. The Churches in which the word of
 " God doth not watch, are shipwrackt.]

And most fully *lib. 4. de Trinitate pag. 31. col. 2.*
 " *Nemini autem dubium esse oportet, &c.* that is, No
 " man ought to doubt but that we must use Gods
 " doctrine for the knowing of divine things. For
 " humane weakness cannot of it self attain the know-
 " ledge of heavenly things. --- It is God himself that
 " we must believe concerning himself, and those things
 " which he offereth to our knowledge, of himself,
 " must we obey. For either we must deny him as
 " the Gentiles do, if we disallow his testimonies; or
 " if he be believed to be God, as he is, nothing of
 " God can be understood, but as he hath witnessed
 " of himself; Let mens own opinions therefore cease
 " (or be laid by) and let not mens judgements extend
 " themselves beyond Gods constitutions --- For the
 " understanding of sayings, must be fetcht from the
 " causes of the speech, because the thing is not subject
 " to the words, but the words to the matter.]

And

And li. 4. *de Trinitate*, pag. 29. col. 1. when he sheweth that the hereticks use to plead Scripture misunderstood, he doth not send them to *Rome* for a judgement of the sence, but still concludeth "[*Respondendum esse existimo hæreticorum perversitati, & omnes eorum stultas ac mortiferas institutiones Evangelicis atque Apostolicis Testimoniis coarguendas* : That is, I judge that we must answer hereticks perverseness, and all their foolish and deadly institutions, by the testimonies of the Gospel and of the Apostles.]

And the same *Hilary* doth largely perswade to a close adhering to the Gospel, and

Hilary ad Constant. Imper.
pag. 307. 196.

the sum of Faith called the Apostles Creed, without adding or altering, under any pretence of amending, and sheweth the divisions and depravations that have followed since the Council of *Nice* would make one emendation, and on their example other Councils had made and mended, done and undone so oft, that they had marr'd all by it: and he perswadeth

the Emperor * to hearken to the ancient Gospel faith and not to Synods. His words are in *Epist. vel Lib. ad Constant. August. pag. (E-dis. Paris.) 307. 308.* where "having shewed how he had

* It is a great doubt: whether this Book were written in *Constantinus* his life time or since his death: of which see *Hieronim. de Scrip. Ecclesiast. Erasmi. Baronius tom. 3. Annal. pag. 714, 715. Bellarmin. de Scrip. Eccles. pag. (mibi)*

85. But its plain by the Epistle it self, that it was written as to *Constantinus* alive, though its possible, as *Bellarmino* conjectureth, that he might be dead, and *Hilary* in *France* not know it; For its clear that was written a little before or after his death, even the same. yeare that he dyed.

erred in looking after Councils, he saith "[*Recog-*
 " *nosce fidem quam*, &c. that is, Reacknowledge that
 " Belief which thou desirest to hear from the Bishops
 " but hearest not. For they of whom it is required
 " do write their own things, and do not preach the
 " things of God; they have drawn about an endless
 " and perpetual circle. For the modesty of humane
 " infirmity should have contained all mysteries of
 " divine knowledge in those bounds of conscience
 " onely, which he believed in, and not after a Be-
 " lief confessed and sworn in Baptism, in the name
 " of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to doubt or
 " innovate any thing else. --- Under the improbable
 " * Of keeping the right " occasion of this necessity
 " sence. " * the custome is come up of
 " writing and renewing the
 " Belief. Which after that it began rather to frame
 " new things, then to retain what was received, it
 " neither defended the old, nor confirmed the new,
 " and Belief is now become rather (a belief) of the
 " times than of the Gospels: while it is written ac-
 " cording to the years, and not held according to the
 " Confession of Baptism. It is a most perillous and
 " miserable thing, that we have as many Beliefs as
 " Wills; and as many Doctrines as manners; and
 " that as many causes of blasphemy spring up, as
 " there are vices. And when according to one God
 " and one Lord, and one Baptism, there is one Be-
 " lief, we are safn from that Belief which is but one,
 " and while many are made, they therefore begin to
 " be, that there may be none. For we are on both
 " sides conscious, that since the meeting of the Coun-
 " cil of *Nice*, we have wrote nothing but *Beliefes*.
 " While there is quarrel about the words and questi-

"ons about the newness, and occasion about the am-
 "biguityes, and complaints about the Authors, and
 "strife about the parties, and difficulty in consents,
 "and while every one begins to be an Anathema to
 "another, almost no one now is Christs. For we
 "are carryed about by an uncertain wind of Do-
 "ctrine, and either while we teach we trouble, or
 "while we are taught we erre. And what is the
 "change that is in the last years belief? The first de-
 "creeth that the word *homonson* shall be silenced :
 "The next decreeth and preacheth the *homonson* :
 "The third doth by indulgence excuse the word *usia*
 "which was simply before used by our fathers. The
 "fourth and last doth not excuse it, but condemn it.
 "and at last its come to this, that there is nothing
 "remaineth establisshed and inviolable with us, nor
 "with any before us. And * *i. e.* That was so with
 "as for the likeness of God us, &c.
 "the Son to God the Father,
 "it is the Belief of our miserable time, that he is not
 "like in whole, or but in part. We are excellent
 "judges (or Arbitrators) * That is, the Councils
 "sure, the seekers of the of those times.
 "heavenly misteries who do
 "calumniate in our professions of the faith of God,
 "we decree yearly and monethly Beliefs of God; we
 "repent of our decrees, we defend them, we Anathe-
 "matize those that were defended, we damne other
 "mens matter in ours, or they damne ours in theirs,
 "and biting one another, we are consumed one of a-
 "nother. A Belief is again sought for, as if there were
 "no beliese. A belief must be written, as if it were
 "not in our hearts. Being already regenerated by
 "faith, we are now taught to believe : As though the
 Rege-

"Regeneration were without Belief. We learn
 "Christ after Baptism; as if Baptism could be any

* Or there could be any "thing * without the faith of
 Baptisme. "Christ --- p. 309. Among

"these shipwracks of faith
 "the heritage of our heavenly patrimony being now

"almost profligate, it is the safest way for us to re-

"tain that first and onely Evangelical Belief confes-

"sed in Baptism and understood, and not to change

"that good Belief which onely I have received and

"heard. Not as if those things which are contain-

* The Council of Nice, "ed in the Council of our

"Fathers, are to be damned

"as irreligiously and impiously written; but be-

"cause through mens rashness they are used to con-

"tradiction, that for this the Gospel might safely

"be denied under the name of novelty, as if it

"were innovated that it might be mended. That

"which is mended alwayes effecteth this, that while

"every amendment doth displease, every amend-

"ment may be condemned by a following amend-

"ment; as if now, whatever it be, it were no amend-

"ment of an amendment, but began to be a con-

"demnation of it. In this much, O Emperor *Con-*

stantinus, I admire thee as of a blessed and Religious

"will, desiring a Belief onely according to what is

"written; and indeed justly hastening to those

☞ "very words of the onely begotten God,

"that the best capable of impartial solicitude, may

"also be full of the knowledge of the words of

"God. He that refuseth this is an Antichrist: and

"he that counterfeiteth it, is Anathema. But

"this one thing I intreat of thee, --- that the Coun-

"cil being present which now quarrels about the Be-
 "lief, thou wilt vouchsafe to hear me a few words,
 "of the Holy Scriptures, and I may speak with thee
 "of the words of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose ba-
 "nished man, or Priest I am.--- O Emperor dost
 "thou seek a Belief! Hear it, not out of newspapers,
 "but out of the Books of God.---Remember, that it
 "is not a question of Philosophy, but in the doctrine
 "of the Gospel. I desire not audience so much for
 "my self as for thee, and the Churches of God.
 "For I have my Belief with my self, and need none
 "from without. That which I have received, I hold,
 "and I change not that which is of God. But yet
 "remember that there is no hereticke but doth falsly
 "pretend that he speaks that in which he blasphem-
 "eth, according to the Scripture.--- (Here he names
 "*Marcellus, Photinus, Sabellius, Montanem, Ma-*
 "*nichæus, Marcion.*) They all speak Scripture
 "without its meaning; they pretend faith without
 "faith. For the Scriptures lie not in reading, but
 "in understanding, nor in prevarication, but in
 "charity. Hear, I pray thee, what is written of
 "Christ, lest under them those things that are not
 "written be preached. Submit thy ears to those
 "things which from (these) Books I shall speak;
 "lift up thy faith to God: Hear that which profit-
 "eth to Belief, to Unity, to Eternity. I will speak
 "to thee with the honor of thy Kingdom and thy
 "faith, all things profitable to the peace of East and
 "West: under the publike knowledge, under a dis-
 "agreeing Council, under a famous contention.--- I
 "will defend nothing to scandal, nor that is without
 "(or besides) the Gospel.] Here he reciteth a short
 creed in Scripture words, especially about Christ.

I confess I fear I am too tedious in these long citations; but I do it, that the Papists may not say that we take particular words or shreds of sentences without the full sence. Here I desire that it may be noted, 1. That Councils may erre and differ. 2. That they are so far from being the authorized judges of our belief, that in *Hilaryes* judgement, their determinations have occasioned the ruine and dangerous divisions of the Church. 3. And that this is not onely true of the *Arrian* Councils, but of the Council of *Nice* it self though its Belief were sound, even by the novelty of terms, and example for further innovating. 4. That *Hilary* never calls the Emperor to consult with the Pope or Church of *Rome* as the authorized infallible judge, even when he professeth to tell him all that was necessary to the peace of the whole Church East and West. If it be said, that this is because Hereticks believed not *Romes* authority or infallibility; I answer, It had then most nearly concerned *Hilary* to teach it them, when he taught them all that was necessary to peace; especially if that be the foundation into which the rest of our faith must be resolved. 5. Lastly note, that it is only the word of God, and the ancient Baptismal Creed which *Hilary* here calls them to for Peace and healing of all the worlds division.

☞ O sad case that this advice was never taken to this day! O happy Church when ever it shall be taken, and never till then.

And here because I am afraid of wearying the Reader, and making these testimonies unproportionable to the brevity of the disputation, I shall forbear adding those that I thought to have added, yet assuring any Papist that readeth it, that it is not for

want

want of more sufficient Testimonies of the Fathers on our side. For I had ready to transcribe in those few books which stand at my elbow, sufficient Testimonies (shorter or longer) in all these following Authors in their own writings, viz. *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Iustin Martyr*, *Irenaeus* the supposed *Dionysius Areop*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Clemens Alexandr*, *Athenagoras*, *Fatianus*, *Arnobius*, *Athanasius*, *Lactantius*, *Macarius*, *Cyril. Alexand.* *Cyril. Hierosol.* *Synesius*, *Epiphanus*, *Ensebius Caesariensis*, *Chrysostomus*, *Gregorius Thaummat.* *Neocesar.* *Greg. Nyssen*, *Basilus Seleucia*, *Ambrose*, *Theodoret*, *Damascenus*, *Isidore Hispal.* *Gaudentius Brixianus*, *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Salvianus Massil.* *Casarius Arelatens.* *Alcuinus vel Albinus*, *Beda*, *Vigilius*, *Joannes Maxentius*, *Alcimus Avitus*, *Prosper*, *Fulgentius*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact.* *Bernard*, with many others, besides all before named: of whom, some speak fully to the point, and all the rest call us to the word of God in Scriptures, for the resolution or ground of our faith, and not to the authority or infallibility of the Pope of *Rome*. I shall onely stay so long as to adde two or three of the eldest (though briefest) and two or three Canons of some Councils, because there will seem more weight in their testimonies. And for any Reader Papist or Protestant that would have more Testimonies to this end (to see whether it be *Romes* authority or infallibility, or rather the Scriptures, that is the Testimony which must support our faith, and is first to be known) I desire them to read them already collected in *Chamier*, in *Docteur Sussive*, in *Sibrandus Lubbertus de princip. Christ. Dogmat. in Chemnisis*, and *Bellarmino* himself who reciteth them out of *Chemnisis*, and pretendeth
(and

(and vainly pretendeth) to answer them, to whom *Lubbertus*, and many more of ours have therein replied : But specially read that excellent Treatise of *Philip Mornay Lord du Plessis* of the Church.

Clemens Rom. ad Corinth. *Clemens Romanus* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* useth not once to them any argument from his authority and infallibility, which sure he would have done for the healing of so great a schisme, if it had been true. Nay when he doth earnestly press them to submit to and obey their own Presbyters, he never requireth any obedience to himself or to the *Roman* Church. Nay so far is he from taking any notice of any universal Monarchy or infallibility in himself that he doth not so much as take notice of any Bishop distinct from a Presbyter in their own Church, nor once call them to be determined by any single or supereminent Bishop at all; but onely to obey their Bishops or Presbyters.

Ignatius ad Rom. *Ignatius* writing to the *Romanes* calleth them onely the Church [*ἡ πρὸς ἀποστολὴν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ Παύλου*] [*Quæ & præsidet in loco regionis Romanorum*] or as Bishop *Ushers* ancient Version hath it [*Quæ & præsidet in loco chori Romanorum*] which is not a presidency over the whole Church. And towards the end, he saith [*Μνημονεύετε ἐν τῇ ἐυχῇ ὑμῶν ὅτι ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳς ἡμεῖς ἀντ' ἐμῆς ποιήμεν χεῖναι τὸ κλειῶν*] i.e. [*Mementores estote in precibus vestris Ecclesia quæ est in Syria, quæ pro me, jam Christo Pastore utitur.*] as *Hier. Vairlenius Sylvius* interpreteth it in his *Edit. pag. 69.* I know that the old vulgar Latin Edition, which is in *Joachimus Perionius* his Edition, pag. 494. and in Bishop *Ushers* pag. 89. translateth it *Mementores in orationibus*

homibus vestris illius qui pro me relicturus est ecclesiam
qua est in Syria] as if it were his successor that he
 would have them pray for : But as *Vairlenius*, so
Vedelius also better translateth it [*Ecclesia qua est*
in Syria, qua pro me jam Domino pastore utitur.]
 (Edit. *Vedel. pag. 250.*) And Bishop *Ussers* old La-
 tine Translation, is [*Ecclesia qua pro me pastore Dei*
utitur.] And the next words are [*μόν & αὐτῷ*
ἐπιμενεῖται καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία αὐτοῦ ἀγαπᾶται] i. e. [*& solus*
eum visitabit & sit vestra in eo dilectio] as the vulgar
 Latin Version, or *Solus ipsam curabit visitabitque*
 As *Vairlenius* and *Vedelius*: or rather as Bishop *Ussers*
 old Latin version [*Solus ipse (Iesus Christus) vice*
Episcopi fit] From whence I gather that the Bishop
 of *Rome* was not the Bishop universal of that *Syrian*
 Church, or else *Ignatius* 1. Would have sure com-
 mended it to his care. 2. Or at least not have ex-
 pressly said that Christ onely was their Bishop when
 he was gone.

Moreover, is it a probable thing that *Ignatius*
 would have so frequently and importunately have
 pressed the Church, that he wrote to in all his E-
 pistles, to be subject to and obey their Bishops, Pres-
 byters and Deacons, and yet would never have given
 them one word of advice to be subject to, and obey
 the Bishop of *Rome*, if the peace and unity of the
 whole Church, and the very faith and salvation of
 the particular members, had so much depended on
 this as the Papists would perswade us? Certainly a
 Negative Argument from the silence of the writers
 of those times, is a sufficient confutation of the Ro-
 mish usurpation.

Polycarp in his Epistle to
Polycarpus Epist. ad Phil. the Philippians, perswadeth
 that

that Church [to be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ] not mentioning any other superior Bishop, much less an universal Bishop to whom also they must be subject. And whereas *Valens* one of their Presbyters was slain (with his wife) into some sin which *Policarpe* professeth his sorrow for, he doth not direct them to seek remedy at any higher power, but perswadeth them to reduce him themselves as a straying member. And having before mentioned divers heresies of those times, he addeth as the Remedy, not an advice of appeal to *Rome*, or to seeke for their determination, or to hold to their infallibility, but [Διὸ ἀπολίποντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ τὴν ψευδοδιδασκαλίαν, ἐπὶ ᾧ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παρεδόθη τὸ λόγον ἐπιστρέψωμεν] i. e. [Wherefore leaving the vanity of many, and false doctrines, let us return to that Word which from the beginning was delivered to us.] It is to the first word, and not to *Rome* that this blessed Disciple of *John* doth send the *Philippians* for stability against errors.

Irenaeus *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* li. 5. c. 26.

Irenaeus is said by *Eusebius* (*Eccles. Hist. li. 5. cap. 26.*) to have sharply reprov'd

Victor for breaking the Churches peace, by excom-

The *Asian* Churches.

municating the *Asian* Churches about Easter day, and

tells him that [The like was never heard of] and that [his predecessors did otherwise] therefore he took not *Victor* to be infallible.

And

And it is apparent that all the *Asian* Churches who stood against *Victor* and were excommunicated by him, did little dream that he was the universal Bishop or infallible. Nay their Bishops [sharply reprehend him and their words are yet extant] saith *Eusebius*.

Moreover in the same Chapter of *Eusebius* it is expressed by *Irenaeus* to *Vict-*

Policarp. ibid.

that *Policarp* the Disciple of *John* differed from *Anicetus*, and neither of them could be perswaded to alter his opinion. Therefore *Policarp* never dream't, either that the *Romane* Bishop was infallible, or was his Governor, whom he should obey.

And its worth the reading in the 24. and 25. Chapters of *Eusebius*, how confidently *Policrates* opposeth *Victor*, alledging a General custome from the Apostles, and resolveth never to change his custome: And the Bishops and Churches here in *England*, did follow the same custome, and differ from *Rome*.

And in the 28 Chapter *Eusebius* mentioneth an ancient writer, that opposed the heresie of *Artemon*, and whereas they alledged that all the Bishops of *Rome* till *Zephyrinus* were of their mind, and preached it, even *Victor* himself (that is, against the Godhead of Christ) he answereth them thus "[This peradventure might seem to have some likelihood of truth, if it were not oppugned, first of all by the holy Scriptures, next by the books of sundry men long before the time of *Victor*] As *Iustin*, *Miltiades*, *Tatianus*, *Clemens*, and *Irenaeus*. So that this old writer supposed it no impossible thing for a Bishop of *Rome* to have taught heresie.

Z

And

that Church [to be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ] not mentioning any other superior Bishop, much less an universal Bishop to whom also they must be subject. And whereas *Valens* one of their Presbyters was slain (with his wife) into some sin which *Policarpe* professeth his sorrow for, he doth not direct them to seek remedy at any higher power, but perswadeth them to reduce him themselves as a straying member. And having before mentioned divers heresies of those times, he addeth as the Remedy, not an advice of appeal to *Rome*, or to seeke for their determination, or to hold to their infallibility, but [Διὰ ἀπολίποντες τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ ταῖς ψευδοδιδασκαλίαις, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῶν παραδεδεγμένῃ λόγῳ ἐπιστρέψωμεν] i. e. [Wherefore leaving the vanity of many, and false doctrines, let us return to that Word which from the beginning was delivered to us.] It is to the first word, and not to *Rome* that this blessed Disciple of *John* doth send the *Philippians* for stability against errors.

Irenaus Euseb. Hist. Eccles. li. 5. c. 26.

Irenaus is said by *Eusebius* (*Eccles. Hist. li. 5. cap. 26.*) to have sharply reprov'd

Victor for breaking the Churches peace, by excommunicating the *Asian* Churches about Easter day, and tells him that [The like was never heard of] and that [his predecessors did otherwise] therefore he took not *Victor* to be infallible.

And

And it is apparent that all the *Asian* Churches who stood against *Victor* and were excommunicated by him, did little dream that he was the universal Bishop or infallible. Nay their Bishops [sharply reprehend him and their words are yet extant] saith *Eusebius*.

Moreover in the same Chapter of *Eusebius* it is expressed by *Irenaeus* to *Victor*, that *Policarp* the Disciple of *John* differed from *Anicetus*, and neither of them could be perswaded to alter his opinion. Therefore *Policarp* never dream't, either that the *Romane* Bishop was infallible, or was his Governor, whom he should obey.

Policarp. ibid.

And its worth the reading in the 24. and 25. Chapters of *Eusebius*, how confidently *Policrates* opposeth *Victor*, alledging a General custome from the Apostles, and resolveth never to change his custome: And the Bishops and Churches here in *England*, did follow the same custome, and differ from *Rome*.

And in the 28 Chapter *Eusebius* mentioneth an ancient writer, that opposed the heresie of *Artemon*, and whereas they alledged that all the Bishops of *Rome* till *Zephyrinus* were of their mind, and preached it, even *Victor* himself (that is, against the Godhead of Christ) he answereth them thus "[This peradventure might seem to have some likelihood of truth, if it were not oppugned, first of all by the holy Scriptures, next by the books of sundry men long before the time of *Victor*] As *Justin*, *Miltiades*, *Tatianus*, *Clemens*, and *Irenaeus*. So that this old writer supposed it no impossible thing for a Bishop of *Rome* to have taught heresie.

Z

And

And in the very conclusion of the Chapter and Book *Ensebins* recites many more of the words of that old writer among the which there are these against the hereticks of those times for presuming to correct and so deprave the Scriptures, which methinks, should touch the Romanists to the quicke:
 “ [Belike they are altogether ignorant what presumption is practised in this wicked deed of theirs. For
 “ either they perswade themselves that the holy Scriptures were not indicted by the instinct of the
 “ Holy Ghost, and so are they Infidels, or else they
 “ think themselves wiser then the Holy Ghost; and
 “ what other thing do they in that than shew themselves possessed of the Devil?]

So that if we must go to the Arbitration of the Pope to know whether the Scriptures were indited by the Holy Ghost. We must go to him to know whether we must be Infidels or not? For they that deny this are Infidels. But I hope all the world will not remain Infidels; till they know the Arbitrement of the Pope, or till his Authority move them to be Christians. For its an impossibility and contradiction, that any man should believe in Christs pretended Vicar, as his Vicar, and believe an authority and infallibility which he or his Church of *Rome* hath received from Christ, before they believe in Christ himself.

How *Tertullian lib. de Pudicitia c. 21.* takes up the Pope, if he pretend to his pardoning power from *Do tibi claves*, or *supra hanc Petram*, I shall for brevity refer you to the place in him.

And *Origen* upon *Math.* on the words, is large and full against them, I refer you to the words themselves in him.

I conclude this ranke of testimonies in the words
 of *Tertullian* [*Credunt sine*
Scripturis ut credant contra *Tertull. de praescript.*
Scripturas] They believe without the Scripture,
 that they may believe against the Scriptures. Had
 Scripture been for the Pope and Papists, then the
 Pope and they would have been for Scriptures; and
 then we might have spared all this ado. But because
 it is against them, no wonder if they be against
 it.

I shall next give a touch more of some passages of
 Councils concerning this controversie. And first it
 is known that the first Councils did commonly de-
 cree that appeals should be from a Bishop to a Sy-
 nod, or the Metropolitane, and that if the Synod
 of Comprovincials disagreed, that the Metropolitane
 should call some of the next Province to assist them,
 and that was the highest, unless there were a more
 general Council, as *Concil. Antiochen. Can. 14.*
 and divers more, beyond doubt, declare: So that
 here was no appeal to the Pope. Yea in the 6. Ca-
 non of that Council of *Antioch*, it is decreed that
 till an offending Priest, Deacon, or Layman, be re-
 conciled to his own Bishop, or else have given satis-
 faction to a Synod, that no other Bishop shall re-
 ceive him: so that *Rome* it self may not receive him:
 much less absolve him.

Also in the 22. Canon of the same Council (and
 in many other Councils) it is decreed that no Bishop
 shall come into the City of another Bishop, not sub-
 ject to him about ordination, and if they there or-
 dain any, it shall be void, and they shall be questi-
 oned by a Synod. And *Chrysostome* hereupon com-
 plaineth of *Theophilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, for

exercising authority at *Constantinople*, out of his own jurisdiction, contrary to the Canons; as may be seen in his first Epistle to Pope *Innocent*. I know they pretend that by that Epistle he yet acknowledged *Innocent's* superiority and jurisdiction: As if a man might not make his moan, or seek all possible relief from any that are capable of helping them, without respect to superiority or jurisdiction; It was *Rome's* greatness and interest in the Emperor and others, and not a universal jurisdiction, that made *Innocent* seem capable of affording some help to

* Which yet he was not able to do.

* *Chrysostome*. But thus *Baronius* the Popes Annalist, where ever he findeth but a

letter written to the Bishop of *Rome*, or his advice or help in any thing desired, doth presently conclude that they acknowledged in the Pope *universale regimen*, an universal Government. And by the like reason many another should be universal Governor as well as he.

Moreover, in the third Council of *Carthage* Can. 26. it is decreed [*Ut prima sedis Episcopus non appellatur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed tantum primæ sedis Episcopus*] that is [That the Bishop of the first seat shall not be called the chief of the Priests, or the chief Priest, or any such thing, but only the Bishop of the first seat.]

One would think that this were as expresse against *Rome's* usurpation, as can be spoken. But they that must be the interpreters of Scripture because it speaks not plain enough, must be judge of Councils too, which it seems can speak no plainer then Scripture, till the Pope have taught them to speak anew.

Or

Or if plainer may be (of the power as well as the name) let us hear the Council of *Milevis* (of which saith *Prosper*, *Aurelius* was the Captain, and *Augustine* the *ingenium* : And *Baronius* saith that *Augustine* was *magna pars* a great part of the Council, and by reason of his great abilities and interest) Whether there were two *Milevitane* Councils, as *Baronius* not improbably thinks, or but one, it much matters not : The Canons are now usually commixt as if they were one, and undoubtedly the true Canons, and so that which is now the 22. Canon runs thus

[*Item placuit ut Presbyteri, Diaconi, vel ceteris inferiores clerici in causis quas habuerint, si de iudicio Episcoporum suorum quassifuerint, vicini Episcopi eos audiant, & inter eos quicquid est siniant adhibiti ab eis ex consensu Episcoporum suorum. Quod si & ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad Primate provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur.*] That is [It seemeth good that Presbyters, Deacons, and the other inferior Clergy, if in their causes they complain of the judgements of their Bishops, neighbor Bishops shall hear them, and being used by them with their Bishops consent, shall end whatever is between them. But if they think good to appeal from them, they may not appeal but to the *Africane* Councils, or to the Primates of their Provinces. But if any think to appeal to those beyond Sea, let none in *Africk* receive him into communion.] * That is, to *Rome* or any other.

Then it was a matter of excommunication to appeal to *Rome*, and consequently

ly, to acknowledge their universal Government : and now it is become essential to a Church, and to a Christian to believe it.

Cencil Nis. Can. 6.

The General Council of Nice before this (according to such Canons as are now extant) C. 6. doth give the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* power over *Egypt, Libia & Pentapolis, quoniam quidem & Episcopo Romano parilis mos est*, Because the Bishop of Rome hath the like custome, so that the Bishop of Rome is equalized with them, and his power restrained to his own Patriarchate, or the *Ecclesia suburbicaria* (of the extent whereof read *Salmasius* his learned Treatise against *Sirmondus de Ecclesiis suburbicariis*) which was so plain to *Cusanus* a Cardinal of Rome, that it made him say, hereupon “ *[Videmus quantum Romanus Pontifex ultra sacras observationes, ex usu Cusanus li. 2. de concord. cap. 12.]* “ *& consuetudine subjectionis alius obedientia hodie requiritur* “ *vis*] That is [We see how

“ much the Pope of Rome hath at this day gotten beyond the sacred observations by use and custome “ of subjectional obedience.] And *Barth. Caranza* having mentioned this Canon in his *summ. Concil. p. 48.* had no other evasion but this, that among all the Greek and Latin Copies which he searched, Cardinal *Marcellus* a Legate at the *Trent* Council, shewed him one Latine Copy that had [*Metropolitane*] instead of [*Romane* ?] But is this much to the purpose? Or if it were, is one Latin Copy in a Cardinals hand more credible then all the rest in the world, that have come to light?

In the 6. Council of *Carthage*, *Aurelius* heard it and *Augustine* was there, and there they again determined

determined that the Bishop of *Rome* should not re-
 ceive the Priests or excommunicate persons that ap-
 pealed to him. And they give this as the Reason
 "[*Quia hoc nulla patrum, &c.*]" That is [Because
 "this was never derogated from the *Africke* Church
 "by any definition of our Fathers, and the *Nicene*
 "Decree do commit both the inferior Clergy, and
 "and the Bishops themselves to their Metropolitans.
 "For they most prudently and justly provided that
 "all businesses should be finished in the places where
 "they were begun: and the grace of the holy Ghost
 "will not be wanting to each province: Let this e-
 "quity be constantly and prudently observed by
 "Christs Priests: especially seeing every man hath
 "leave, if he be offended with the judgement of
 "the known, to appeal to a Council of his Province,
 "or to a General Council. Unless there be any man
 "that can think that God can inspire a Justice of Try-
 "al into any one person, and deny it to innumerable
 "that are congregated in Council.]

And whereas the Bishop of *Rome* would have sent
 his Legates into those parts, to take cognisance of
 their affairs, they answered [*Ut aliqui tanquam a*
 "*tua sanctitatis latere ad nos mittantur, nulla inve-*
 "*nimus Patrum Synodo constitutum*] That is [That
 "any should be sent against as Legates from your
 "sanctity, to us, is a thing which we find not con-
 "stituted by any Synod of the Fathers] But here
Gratian hath falsified the Canon, by the addition
 of a [*Save to the See of Rome*] where the *Milevi-*
tan Canon is repeated: In which manner they have
 used too much of the Churches records.

Can we think that *Augustine* and the rest of the Bishops in these Councils did not understand what they did, and purposely restrain the *Romane* ambition?

The case also which is related in *Augustine* between the Catholikes and the Donatists shews how far they were in those dayes from dreaming of the *Romane* decisive judgement. The great controversie was, who had the true Church the Donatists, or the Catholikes? And the Donatists great Arguments were, that *Cecilian* had been ordained by Traditors, and therefore his party and those that communicated with them were not the Church nor to be communicated with. Mark now how the Catholikes plead this cause. 1. They procure it heard by the Emperors *Cognitor*, *Marcellinus*; and not by the Pope. 2. They never once fetch their proof that the Catholike Church was theirs from their agreement with *Rome*, or subjection to the Pope, nor once in all their mention of the Catholike Church do give the Popish description of it, or fetch it from the *Romane* Bishop as the head; but over & over again they prove that their Church is the Catholike Church because it is [That which beginning at *Jerusalem*, is transfused over all the world.] and frequently they give this same description of it, and hence prove it out of Scripture, as is apparent in *Austins* writings at large. They never say, the Catholike Church is the *Romane* or that which submitteth to the Pope. 3. Note (which is the chief thing that here I do intend) that it was publikely proved in the conference that first *Melchiades* Bishop of *Rome*, with other Bishops were appointed to hear the business between *Donatus a nigris Casis*, and *Cecilianus*, and that they ab-

solved

solved *Cacilianus*, and condemned *Donatus* And then that the *Donatists* rested not here but appealed to the Emperor, and the Emperor caused a certain number of Bishops to meet at *Arles* to hear over all the cause again, and these Bishops not agreeing (though they were most of them against *Donatus*) the Emperor *Constantine* was fain to determine the matter himself, who absolved *Felix* and *Cacilianus*, and condemned the *Donatists*, yet giving them *liberum arbitrium*, as it was called then, or Liberty of conscience, as it is called now. So that the Bishop of *Rome* acteth but as appointed with others; and his judgement is not that highest from which there is no appeal; for the Bishops at *Arles* must judge of all again, and the Emperor after them. Of all this see *Augustine in Brevicul. Collation cum Donat.* throughout, specially pag. 288. (Edit. Paris.) & lib. ad *Donatist. post. Collation. cap. 33. pag. 245.*

I shall onely adde to these Testimonies foregoing, the witness of some of their own party. I have before shewed that one part of their Church denyeth the Popes infallibility, and the other a Councils: and that they are not agreed about the ultimate resolution of their faith. Their Cardinal *Nic. Cusanus li. de Concord. Cathol. c. 13. & 34.* maintaineth that [All Bishops are equal as to the jurisdiction, though not as to the execution, because the executive exercise is restrained by certain positive bounds, and that for the better, to bring men to God, which when it ceaseth, the positive rights cease] And he saith that in time of necessity a simple Priest may absolve even one that is excommunicated by the Pope; And concludeth that the Papacy is but of Positive right; and that both it, and all Majority among

mong Bishops is constituted by subjectional consent that the power of binding and loosing is immediately from Christ, and therefore that Priests are equal, and that the distinction of Diocess, and that a Bishop should be over the Presbyters, are of positive right. And that Christ gave no more to *Peter* then to the rest of the Apostles, nor said more to him then to them, Yea and he addeth, that if the Bishop of *Trevers* were by the congregate Church chosen to be their President and head, he should properly be more the successor of *Peter* then the Bishop of *Rome*.] This is plain dealing for a Cardinal.

**Occham & Almaine* in 3. sent. D. 24. conc. 6. dub. 6. There are many heretical Decretals *Alph. a Castro* adv. bar. l. 1. c. 4. *Waldens. Doct. fid. l. 2. ar. 2. c. 19. § 1. § 38. N. 4. Leg. Card. de Alliaco de reform. Eccles. Picus in quest. resp.*

Adco us jam horrendam quorundam proverbium est a l'cum statum devenisse Ecclesiam, ut non sit digna regi nisi per reprobo inquit Card. de Alliaco.

* That the like passages are frequent in *Girson* is so well known that I need not mention them. And in Cardinal *de Alliaco*, and many other Cardinals, Bishops, and Schoolmen of their own, the like passages are well known, and so oft cited already, that I shall forbear to recite them.

I have oft times observed how they have alledged *Durandus*, as pleading that the last resolution of our faith is into this *primo creditum*, that the Church is guided by the holy Ghost, and that therefore we believe the Scripture to be Gods word e. g. the Gospel of *Matthew* rather then that of *Nicodemus*, because the Church approveth it, who is guided by the spirit. But I find that even there *Durandus* destroyeth

eth the *Romane* cause. For he immediately addeth,
 that "[*Hoc quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturæ*
per Ecclesiam intelligitur solum de Ecclesia quæ fuit
tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti spiritu
sancto, & nihilominus viderunt Miracula Christi
& audierunt ejus doctrinam, & ob hoc fuerunt con-
venientes testes omnium quæ Christus fecit aut docuit
ut per eorum testimonium

scriptura continens facta & dicta Christi approbaretur] *Durandus in sem. li. 3.*
Dist. 24. q. 1. pag. mibi
576.

That is, "[This which is

said of the approbation of the Scripture by the
 Church is onely meant of the Church which was
 in the times of the Apostles, who were filled with
 the Holy Ghost, and also saw the Miracles of
 Christ, and heard his doctrine, and therefore
 were fit witnesses of all that Christ did or taught
 that by their testimony
 the Scripture containing
 the deeds and words of
 Christ, might be approv-
 ed]

Vid. Zabarell. Cardin.
Florent. in li. Schism. &
Conc. That future Coun-
cils may abrogate that
which was unjustly done

in former, and that they may erre.

This he proveth from Scripture, and concludeth,
 that the Gospels which that Church approved cannot
 now be rejected, because there is not the like cause,
 and that [*Immo tenens contrarium hereticus est, cu-*
juscunque status aut conditionis existat] [Yea he that
 holdeth the contrary is a heretick, of what state or
 condition soever he be] Not excepting the Pope
 himself. Is this liker the doctrine of Papiſts or of
 Protestants?

Yea one word to Master *Knot* and those of his
 prin-

ciples, that will resolve their faith into the Miracles of the present *Rome* Church. If those Miracles which they glory in be indeed regardable, then the Church of *Rome* is not infallible; for the author of those Miracles do witness them to be fallible. The old Saint *Austin* and the rest of his time and before, whose testimonies about Miracles they bring in, as I have sufficiently proved are against their usurped jurisdiction and infallibility. Their Saint *Mand* saith, that the *Romane* Church shall ere long Apostatize from the faith totally and openly, which did obscurely Apostatize of a long time before. Their Saint *Elizabeth* saith, That Christ the head of the Church cryeth out but

Abbas Joachim in Jerem.

his members are dead: that the Apostolike seat is possessed with pride, and the flocks go astray. The supposed Prophet *Abbas Joachim* saith "[There is yet
" another figtree withered by the curse of prevari-
" cation; the Latin Church, or the Ship of *Peter*,
" whose temporal leaves are made covers to excuse
" sin, with which both *Adam* the Pope, and *Eve* the
" subjects of the Church do
" cover the dishonesty of their
" lives, and miserably hide
" themselves in the wood
" of Ecclesiastical Glory.]

See many of the Papists
cited against themselves
by Doctor *Sutlive de Ec.*
cles. c. 11. pag. 55. 56, 57.

But I will trouble my self and the Reader with no more of this work, fearing that I have trespassed in doing more than needs in so plain a case, already. I will therefore shut up all that I have to say from humane Testimony, with the words of *Chrysostom* (or whoever else is the author of the imperfect work on *Math.*) and his own certain expressions elsewhere.

In the Imperfect *Comment.* (*Edit. Commel. an. 1617.*)

in Math. 20. Hom. 35. pag.

900. 901. it is said as follow-

eth "[*Fructum humilitatis*

"*terrestria posuit primatum celestem, & primatus*

"*terrestria fructum, posuit confusionem celestem.*

"*Quicunque ergo desiderat primatum celestem, se-*

"*quatur humilitatem terrestrem; quicunque autem*

"*desiderat, primatum in terra, inveniet confusionem*

"*in celo: ut jam inter servos Christi non sit de prima-*

"*incertamen]* That is [He hath made the Celestial

"primacy to be the fruit of terrestrial humility: and

"the fruit of earthly Primacy, he hath appointed

"to be Celestial confusion *.

"Whosoever therefore de-

"sireth Celestial primacy let

"him follow terrestrial humility: but whosoever de-

"sireth Primacy on earth, shall find confusion in

"heaven: That so among the servants of Christ

"there may be no strife for Primacy.]

And afterward he addeth [*Primatum autem Ec-*

"*clesiasticum concupiscere, neque ratio est neque cau-*

"*sa: quia neque justum est, neque utile: Quis enim*

"*sapiens ultro se subicere festinat servituti, labori,*

"*dolori, & quod majus est, periculo tali, ut det ra-*

"*tionem pro omni Ecclesia apud justum judicem, nisi*

"*forte qui nec credit judicium Dei, nec timet, uti*

"*abutens primatu suo Ecclesiastico seculariter, con-*

"*vertat eum in secularem.]* That is [But to desire

"an Ecclesiastical Primacy, there is neither reason

"nor cause, because it is neither just nor profitable:

"For what wise man will voluntarily hasten to sub-

"ject himself to servitude, labor, grief, and which

"is more to such a danger, as to be accountable to

"the righteous judge for all the Church? unless it

be

Opus Imperf. in Math.
Hom. 35. pag. 900. 901.

* That is, confusion
from heaven.

“be one that perhaps doth neither believe the judgement of God, nor seareth it, that abusing secularly his Ecclesiastical primacy, he may turn it into a secular.” One would think this should be plain enough against the Papal usurpation! If they tell me that this is none of *Chrysostomes* works, but some hereticks; I answer, When they have use for it, they can magnifie it. Let their *Sixtus Senensis* words be weighed which are printed before this book, especially what he saith of some ancient Copies, which have the errors onely in the Margin, written by some *Arrian* hand, and withall that it is very observable, that the errors are so intermixed, that yet you may take them out, and not maim any of the sence, but leave the rest entire; yea they seem as parenthtical or superfluous, and then conjecture whether yet it may not be *Crysofomes*: But whose so ever it is, it is ancient, and commonly much commended. But let that go which way it will, as long as in the undoubted works of *Crysofome* there is over and over again the like. In his *Homil. 66. alias 67. in Mat. 20. pag.*

Chrysoft. on Math. 20.
Hom. 67. Grec. 66. juxta
Edit. Comm. pag. 577.

577. he saith “[They that seek Primacy, are a disgrace to themselves not knowing that by this means they shall thrust themselves into the lowest] state. The like he hath in *Homil. on Math. 18.*

I shall now leave it to the consideration of the impartial, by this small taste of the judgement of former times, whether the *Romane* infallibility and universal government were a thing known to the Church of Christ of old, or yielded as soon as ambitiously sought? And whether this be a fit ground for us to build our faith upon, or

resolve it into? And if any would see more of the resistancy of their usurpations, even when it was at the highest, he may read in *Mich. Goldastus* a multitude of Volumes, that will give him further information: or in Bishop *Usher de Success. & Stat. Eccles.* he may find enough in narrower room.

The last part of this disputation should consist of an answer to the Popish Arguments for their cause: but I can find so little in any of their writings that's worthy to be taken notice of, more then what is answered before, that I shall not need to stand long upon this.

They tell us that, if our Church be not infallible, then people have small reason to hear us or regard us? or to trust their salvation on the doctrine which we deliver to them, seeing for ought we know, or they know, we may but deceive them, as being first our selves deceived; so that this makes way to infidelity or uncertainty of the faith, if the Church be not infallible.

This is their all, the first and last, for ought I can find (that's worth the repeating) and of how little value this arguing is, me thinks should be very easie to apprehend.

1. Look back to the stating of the Question, and remember how far we say the Church is fallible, and how far infallible, and it may suffice to confute all this.

2. Its not all one to be absolutely infallible, and to be actually Not-mistaken. Nor to be certain of some things, and to be certain of all things that ought to be known or believed: Nor to be certain by such external evidence of verity and internal

nal grace , as is ordinary to the faithful , and to be certain by a pretended priviledge above all the rest of the world ; even knowing the conclusion as such without knowing the medium. We are certain that Scripture is Gods word : and certain that we are certain ; and therefore *pro tempore* infallibly certain : And if we should say that we are certain that no true Believer shall ever fall from this certainty , we should speak more agreeably to the Protestant doctrine than to yours , who say that they may fall away. And we maintain that there is still an Objective certainty or Infallibility (if I may use the word actively) in the word of God and every sentence of it , which can never fail , if our faith should fail. And we can manifest to our hearers such grounds of their belief , as are infallible , and will never deceive those that trust in them

Your argument therefore most vainly supposeth , that mens faith must be grounded on the word and credit of their Teachers , and that therefore they can have no stronger a faith , then is answerable to our credit with them. But its no such matter : It is Gods Veracity and not ours that is the formal object of the hearers faith : We do not desire (as it seems the Papists do) that they should take their faith on trust from us , and believe all on our words. We do but reveal to them that word of God , which is the ground of faith ; and we prove it to be the word of God , and shew them that in it which will prove it self to be so : so that as long as our Reasons , Proofs , Evidences are infallible , what necessity is there that the speaker must be infallible , and that in every thing that ought to be believed ? Are all the Preachers of the *Romish* faction infallible ? You will say ,

say, no, your selves. Must they not therefore be heard? Or may not the doctrine which they preach beget a certain belief in the hearer? You will, I know, both one voice, say, that it may and doth. How then do fallible men among you, by preaching bring men to an infallible faith (*in him*) and why may it not be so with us? Will you say that you preach in the name of the Pope who is infallible? Why but, how do your hearers know that? Must they take it on the preacher's word, who proclaimeth himself fallible? Why then, may they not as well take it on our words that Christ and Scripture is infallible? When we say, we preach in Christ's name, as confidently as you say that you preach in the Pope's name? and so your doctrine and ours should be both uncertain, if both rested on the fallible preachers word. But if you will not bid your hearers take your word, but will undertake to demonstrate to them by cogent evidence, that you are sent by the Pope, and that he is infallible, and that you speak nothing but what he infallibly warranteth you to speak (all which will be incumbent on you to prove) then will we much more easily and truly prove, that God is true and that Scripture is his word (which is all that is incumbent on us to prove; seeing an infallible word, of an infallible God, must be heard, how fallible soever we may be) so that you might easily see, if you would that your task is incomparably harder then ours (even as much as to prove a falshood is harder then to prove a truth.)

How will you approve of such reasoning as your own in other cases! What if ten men that have been at a fight, come home and tell you, which side had

the better? though they are all fallible, may they not possibly give you such infallible proof of what they say, as may make it certain? What if all the Lawyers in the Land are fallible men, yea and all other men in the Land; and do not know all things, nor all that should be known about the Lawes? Doth it follow that these fallible men, may not infallibly know themselves and infallibly prove to others, even by certain humane testimony, incapable of deceit, that this or that is indeed a statute Law of the Land made by King and Parliament? Do all men hold their lands and lives by Law, and so many dye at the Gallows by Law, and yet is it uncertain whether they be the Laws indeed or not, and all because the men that say so, are not infallible (and all are dead that saw them made!) Why but a man may be certain of many a thing that yet is not infallible in all things, nor in all that he ought to know. Your argument therefore is strong against your selves, who resolve mens faith into humane credit, but its nothing against us, who resolve it into Gods veracity, and teach not men to take all upon trust from our bare words. It is sufficient that God is infallible when we perswade them to believe, and that we can infallibly prove to them that the Scripture is Gods word, and what it containeth in the points of necessity to salvation. We can without infallibility in all other matters, infallibly prove to them what God requireth them to Believe and Do as Necessary to Salvation. It is the infallibility of our proofs, and not of our bare words, that is necessary to mens belief. But the Papists expect their misled flock should take their bare word, and so make the faith of their followers, a humane faith; and to blind the business they pretend

to a certain infallibility as if their sayings were Divine.

Men will make use of Physicians for their bodies though they be not infallible: Much more might they do it with encouragement, if they could infallibly tell them the true cure of every mortal disease, though there were an hundred smaller diseases that they could not cure, or a hundred questions in Anatomy and about the nature of diseases which they could not resolve. Why then should men conceit that the Ministry is vain that is not infallible, and knoweth not all things. Hath Gods Church been without infallible ordinary guides from the creation to this day, and we must now begin to feign a Necessity of their infallibility? Let it be sufficient that God, and the extraordinarily inspired Prophets and Apostles are infallible, and that we have Teachers that can infallibly prove to us what he requireth of us in his words in points of Necessity to our everlasting happiness.

And for themselves, pretending to infallibility makes them not, nor procureth them infallible, whereas their voluminous errors, and the wicked practices grounded thereupon, and their frequent self-contradictions and mutations, do proclaim aloud to the world that they are both deceivable, deceived and deceivers: while the holy Scriptures whose sufficiency they deny is by themselves confessed to be of infallible verity.

We are resolved therefore by the grace of God, in a business of such moment as the everlasting saving or losing of our souls to venture

and bottom all our Hopes on that word of God
whose infallibility they confess, then on the words
of men who pretend to infallibility, and notoriously
declare the vainty of those pretences.

Some



Some more of the Sence of Antiquity in the
main Controversie between us and the Pa-
pists, to declare further who it is that is of
the New Religion.

CYrill. Hierosol. Cateches 4. Sect. de spiritu sancto,
pag. (Edit. Paris. 1631.) 30.

Ἀπὸ γὰρ μηδὲ τῶν θείων καὶ ἀγίων τῶν μυστηρίων, &c.

i. e. For concerning Divine things, and the holy
mysteries of faith, nothing, no not the smallest thing
ought to be delivered without the Divine Scriptures;

nor to be brought forth by

simple probability, nor by

atrain of words. Nay do

not simply believe me my self

when I speak of these things

to thee, unless thou receive a demonstration of the

things which I speak from the Divine Scriptures For

the very safety of our faith, resteth not on the ele-

gancy of speech, but on the proof of Divine Scri-

ptures.]

✎
If the Tongue of man
can speak plain this is
plain.

And pag. 36. Sect de Sacra Script. he telleth you

what Scriptures he meaneth earnestly dissuading

from the Apocryphal books, and numbering the

same onely which we own as Canonical, save that he

saith [Ἱερειῶν καὶ βασιλέων καὶ ἐπιστολῆς] and

omitteth the Epist. to Hebrews and the Apocalypse.

And *Cateches.* 17. pag. 192. he saith [And we now also ingeniously confels that we will not use humane reasonings; but will only commemorate those things which are in the holy Scriptures: for this is most safe as Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 2. 4.

And *Cateches.* 18. pag. 220, 221, 222. See how he describeth the Catholike Church without the least intimation of the *Romane* description.

August. Cont. literas Petiliani li. 3. cap. 6. pag. Edit. Paris. 127.) col. 1.

[*Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive*

Note here, 1. That it is, *Ecclesia* yal *quacunque re alia*, that *Austin* speaks, 2. That its *non omnibus*, and therefore not an Argument onely for such as deny the Church and right grounds. 3. So do we procure the flames of Popish hatred.



4. So may we say [As if we had bid the Apostles put nothing in the Bible to prove the *Romane Catholike Church*,

de quacunque alia re qua pertinet ad fidem utramque nostram; non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet si nos, sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, Si Angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit preterquam quod in Scripturis legalibus & Evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit. Hæc

vobiscum & cum omnibus quos Christo lucrati cupimus adstantes, atque inter cetera sanctam Ecclesiam quam in

Dei liris promissam legimus & sicut promissa est in omnibus gentibus reddi cernimus, prædicantes, ab iis quos ad ejus pacificum gremium attrahi cupimus, pro actione gratiarum flammam meruimus odiorum.] That is [Moreover, whether it be of Christ, or of his Church, or of any other thing which pertaineth to our faith and life, I say

not

not [if we] who are not to be compared to him who said [Though we] but that which he next added [If an Angel from heaven shall preach to you any other thing then that which you have received in the Scriptures of the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed. While we deal thus with you and with all men whom we desire to win to Christ, and among other things, do preach the holy Church, which we find promised in Gods Scriptures, and which we see to be placed in all Nations as was promised, we have deserved (or procured) the flames of hatred from those whom we desire to draw into its pacifike bosome instead of thanks.] And he proceedeth [as if it were we that so long before had bid the Prophets and Apostles that they should not put in their books any Testimonies, by which the faction (or party) of *Donatus* is proved to be the Church of Christ.]

The Epistle *ad Demetriadem* commonly reckoned the 142. among *Augustines* cap. 9. saith [Scito itaque in Scripturis divinis (per quas solas potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem) &c.] By the Divine Scriptures alone thou maist understand the full will of God.] I know the *Lovaine* Doctors put this Epistle in the Appendix and conjecture it to be of *Pelagius*: but 1. it shews the doctrine of that age: 2. Never did *Austin* contradict it, but oft say the like.

August. de peccat. Merit. & Remiss. li. 2. cap. 36. pag. (mibi) 304. saith "[*Talis populus ut praxi, eruditus in Regno calorum per duo testamenta vetus & novum, non declinans in dextram superba presumptione justitie, neque in sinistram secuva delectatione peccati, in terram illius promissionis intrabit:] & postea* [Ubi enim de re obscurissima disputatur, non adjuvantibus Divinarum Scripturarum certis clarisque

And *Cateches.* 17. pag. 192. he saith [And we now also ingeniously confels that we will not use humane reasonings; but will only commemorate those things which are in the holy Scriptures: for this is most said as Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 2. 4.

And *Cateches.* 18. pag. 220, 221, 222. See how he describeth the Catholike Church without the least intimation of the *Romane* description.

August. Cont. literas Petiliani li. 3. cap. 6. pag. Edit. Paris. 127.) col. 1.

[Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive

Note here, 1. That it is, Ecclesia vel quacunque re a-
lia, that Austin speaks,
2. That its not omnibus,
and therefore not an Ar-
gument onely for such as
deny the Church and
right grounds. 3. So do
we procure the flames of
Popish hatred.



4. So may we say [As if
we had bid the Apostles
put nothing in the Bible
to prove the *Romane* Ca-
tholike Church.

de quacunque alia re qua per-
tinet ad fidem utramque no-
stram; non dicam nos, nequa-
quam comparandi ei qui dixit,
Licet si nos, sed omnino quod
secutus adjecit, Si Angelus de
cælo vobis annuntiaverit pre-
terquam quod in Scripturis
legalibus & Evangelicis acce-
pistis, anathema sit. Hæc

vobiscum & cum omnibus
quos Christo lucrati cupimus
aditantes, atque inter cetera
sanctam Ecclesiam quam in

Dei licetis promissam legimus
& sicut promissa est in omnibus gentibus reddi cerni-
mus, prædicantes, ab eis quos ad ejus pacificum gre-
minum attrahi cupimus, pro actione gratiarum flammam
meruimus odiorum.] That is [Moreover, whether
it be of Christ, or of his Church, or of any other
thing which pertaineth to our faith and life, I say
not

not [*if we*] who are not to be compared to him who said [*Though we*] but that which he next added [*If an Angel from heaven shall preach to you any other thing then that which you have received in the Scriptures of the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed.* While we deal thus with you and with all men whom we desire to win to Christ, and among other things, do preach the holy Church, which we find promised in Gods Scriptures, and which we see to be placed in all Nations as was promised, we have deserved (or procured) the flames of hatred from those whom we desire to draw into its pacifike bosome instead of thanks.] And he proceedeth [as if it were we that so long before had bid the Prophets and Apostles that they should not put in their books any Testimonies, by which the faction (or party) of *Donatus* is proved to be the Church of Christ.]

The Epistle *ad Demetriadem* commonly reckoned the 142. among *Augustines* cap. 9. saith [*Scito itaque in Scripturis divinis (per quas solus potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem) &c.*] By the Divine Scriptures alone thou maist understand the full will of God.] I know the *Lovaine* Doctors put this Epistle in the Appendix and conjecture it to be of *Pelagius*: but 1. it shews the doctrine of that age: 2. Never did *Austin* contradict it, but oft say the like.

August. de peccat. Merit. & Remiss. li. 2. cap. 36. pag. (mibi) 304. saith "[*Talis populus ut praxi, eruditus in Regno calorum per duo testamenta vetus & novum, non declinans in dextram superba presumptione justitie, neque in sinistram secunda delectatione peccati, in terram illius promissionis intrabit:*] & postea [*Ubi enim de re obscurissima disputatur, non adjuvantibus Divinarum Scripturarum certis clarisque*

documentis, cohibere se debet humana presumptio nihil faciens in partem alteram declinando] So that in *Augustinus* judgement the old and new Testament teach us enough to salvation; and in the difficult points we must not so much as incline to either side, without the Scriptures, it being presumption to speak when they are silent.

And in his 49. Tract. on *John* he saith [*Evangelista testatur multa Dominum Christum & dixisse & fecisse quae non scripta sunt, electa sunt autem quae scriberentur, quae saluti credentium sufficere videbantur.*] i. e. [The Evangelist testifieth that the Lord Christ spoke and did many things that are not written: but those were chosen to be written, which seemed sufficient for the salvation of Believers.]

And *li. de Nat. Grat. c. 26.* he saith to the *Pelagians* [*Solis Canonicis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensum*] That is [I owe a consent without any refusal to the Canonical Scriptures alone] An hundred more such sayings might be cited out of *Augustine*.

Hierome on the first Ch. of *Hag.* (*sol mihi. 102.*) speaking of the use of Hereticks, saith [*Sed & alia*

Andradam Defen. l. 2.
Vainly replyeth that this is spoken onely to those Hereticks that plead only Tradition and reject Scriptures. 1. That plainly false: for *Tatianus* did not so. 2. He speaks of all such traditions therefore of the Popish.

quae absque autoritate & testimoniis Scripturarum quasi traditione Apostolica sponte reperiant atque consignant percussit gladius Dei.] i. e. [But other things which without the Authority and Testimonies of Scripture they do of their own accord find out and feign as of Apostolical tradi-

tion the sword of God will cut down.] And he

instanceth in the fastings and other austerities of the *Tatiani*, which he saith they suffer causlesly.

The same *Hierom* against *Helvidius* saith [*Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus. Natum Deum esse de virgine credimus quia legimus: Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus*] So then the Church in *Hieromes* time would believe no more by Divine Faith, but what was written.

Chrysostome saith on the 95. *Psal.* [when any thing is spoken that is not written, the very thoughts of the hearers are lame] And again on the 2 *Thess.* 2. [All things are clear and sincere that are in the Divine Scriptures, every thing that is necessary is therein plain] The words are spoken against those that would not go to the Congregation because there was no Sermon; And though *Chrysostome* was almost daily in preaching, yet to shew them that the word read was worth their hearing, he addeth this answer: And he proceedeth to answer their other objections taken from the supposed obscurity of Scripture, telling them they are spoken in their own tongue and plainly. *Orat.* 3. pag. (mibi) 1503.

And on 2 *Cor.* *Hom.* 3. he calleth the Scripture the ballance, the square and rule of all things; which words *Bellarmino de verbo Dei* l. 4. c. 11. endeavor-eth to pervert in vain.

Theodoret Dialog. 1. inter *Orthodox.* & *Eranist.* in the beginning (pag. 1.) saith [I would not have thee by humane reasons to enquire after the truth, but seek the steps of the Apostles and Prophets and their followers] And in the second Dialogue [I am not so rash as to assert any thing wherein the holy Scripture is silent.]

Cyrl.

Cyrl of Alexandria in his seventh book against Julian (pag. mihi 159.) saith [The Divine Scripture is sufficient to make them that are exercised in it, wise and most honest, and to have sufficient understanding.] The like he hath twice or thrice over in that same Section, which I will not stand to repeat lest I be tedious.

Ambrose having mentioned the diversity of Heresies agreeing in *una perfidia*, giveth us this direction for cure: *Itaque tanquam boni gubernatores quo tutius prætermicare possimus fidei vela tendamus Scripturarumque relegamus ordinem.* Amb. de fide. li. 1. cap. 4. pag. 56. And many more expresse passages he hath: as [*Quæ in Scripturis sanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum usurpare possemus?*] This citation I take on trust from others that have before produced it, having before mentioned more.

Athanasius in his Orat. against the Gentiles in the beginning saith [The holy and Divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient for all instruction of verity] And afterward he addeth that the writings of the Fathers and our Teachers do help us to interpret and understand Scripture.

Hippolytus (in Bibliothec. Patrum Tom. 3. Edit. col. p. 20. 21.) saith [Unus Deus est, quem non aliunde agnoscimus, quam ex sacris scripturis. Quemadmodum enim si quis vellet sapientiam huius seculi exercere, non aliter hoc consequi poterit, nisi dogmata Philosophorum legat: sic quicumque volumus pietatem in Deum exercere non aliunde discimus quam in scripturis Divinis] i. e. [There is one God, whom we no o-

* That is [Savingly.] ther way know, * but by the holy Scriptures: For as he that will exercise the wisdom of this world, cannot other-

otherwise attain it, but by reading the opinions of the Philosophers: so those of us that will exercise piety towards God, do no other way learn it but in the Divine Scriptures.

Clemens Alexandrinus Stromat. li. 6. saith [Without the Scripture we say nothing.]

In the Life of *Antony* the Author saith [The Scriptures are sufficient for our instruction.]

Theodoret li. 1. histor. c. 7 reporteth the words of *Constantine* the Great spoken to the Fathers in the *Nicene Council*, after *Eustathius* Oration to him, thus "[He shewed them
"how grievous a thing it was *Constantinus Magnus.*

"and how bitter, when the enemies were profligate,
"and there was none left that durst oppose them,
"that they should strive against one another, and
"should make mirth for their enemies, and become
"their laughing stock: specially seeing they dispute
"about Divine things, and have the doctrine of the
"Holy Ghost laid down in the Scripture monuments:
"For, saith he, the Books of the Evangelists and A-
"postles, and also the Oracles of the ancient Pro-
"phets do evidently teach us what we are to hold con-
"cerning God. Laying aside therefore all seditious
"contention, let us resolve the matters that are
"brought into question, by the Testimonies of the
"writings of Gods inspiration] And *Theodoret* add-
"eth, that [While he spoke these and the like things
"to bring them to a consent in the Apostolical do-
"ctrine, all the Synod except a few *Arrians* obeyed
"and stablished concord on these terms.

Yet doth *Andradius* think to disable *Constantines* testimony by saying that the *Arrians* were pleased with these words of *Constantine*, and *Bellarmino* vainly endeavoureth to lessen their esteem, because *Constantine* was no Doctor of the Church.

Salvian saith [Si scire vis quid tenendum sit habes literas, sacras perfectæ ratio est hoc tenere quod legeris] i. e. [You see Scripture is the only Rule of Faith with him.]

But I will once more stop this work of citations, it being so fully done already. Onely desiring the Reader to lay those before produced together with these last, and to compare with them, 1. the Protestants judgement, and then the Papists, I shall lay them here by him, that seeing them together he may the better judge.

And for the judgement of the Reformed Churches, I shall say no more then what I before mentioned out of their own *Polidore Virgil* [That they are called *Evangelical*, because they maintain that no Law is to be received in matters of salvation, but what is delivered by Christ or his Apostles] And this is in the Scripture fully contained and safely delivered to us (which kind of Tradition of the books of the old and new Testament as Canonical, saith *Molinæus* we readily receive, which is so far from being an addition to Scripture, that it tells us that nothing is to be added thereto) Compare this with the Fathers judgment before laid down.

As for the Papists judgement you shall have it in their own words, lest we seem to wrong them.

Vas-

Vasquez Tom. 2. Disp. 216. N. 60. saith [*Licet concederemus hoc fuisse Apostolorum preceptum, nihilominus Ecclesia & summus Pontifex potuerunt illud iustis de causis abrogare: Neque enim maior fuit potestas Apostolorum, quam Ecclesia & Pontificis inferendis preceptis.*] That is [Though we should grant that this was a precept of (the Apostles, nevertheless the Church and the Pope might, upon just causes abrogate it: For [the power of the Apostles was not greater then that of the Church, and Pope in making precepts.]

The Council of Trent say, Sess. 21. c. 1. 2. that [This power was alway in the Church, that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it might ordain or change things as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the receiver.] (So that they may change any thing that God appointeth about Sacraments, except the substance: And it were well if they would have left that unchanged.)

The Council of Constance took the cup from the Laity [*Licet in primitiva Ecclesia huiusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie.*] Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received of the faithful under both kinds.] So that they confess they contradict the Primitive Church.

Bellarmino plainly saith li. 4. de Pontif. c. 5. [*Si Papa erraret in precipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona & virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.*] That is [If the Pope should erre in commanding vices, and forbidding virtues, the Church were bound to believe that vices are good, and vertues bad,

Yet doth *Andradis* think to disable *Constantines* testimony by saying that the *Arrians* were pleased with these words of *Constantine*, and *Bellarmino* vainly endevoreth to lessen their esteem, because *Constantine* was no Doctor of the Church.

See *Andrad.* 7 of l. 2. fol. 110. 150 Where are the rest of his cavils.

Salvian saith [Si scire vis quid tenendum sit habes literas, sacras perfectæ ratio est hoc tenere quod legeris] i. e. [You see Scripture is the only Rule of Faith with him.

But I will once more stop this work of citations, it being so fully done already. Onely desiring the Reader to lay those before produced together with these last, and to compare with them, i. the Protestants judgement, and then the Papists, I shall lay them here by him, that seeing them together he may the better judge.

And for the judgement of the Reformed Churches, I shall say no more then what I before mentioned out of their own *Polidore Virgil* [That they are called *Evangelical*, because they maintain that no Law is to be received in matters of salvation, but what is delivered by Christ or his Apostles] And this is in the Scripture fully contained and safely delivered to us (which kind of Tradition of the books of the old and new Testament as Canonical, saith *Molinæus* we readily receive, which is so far from being an addition to Scripture, that it tells us that nothing is to be added thereto) Compare this with the Fathers judgment before laid down.

As for the Papists judgement you shall have it in their own words, lest we seem to wrong them.

Vas-

Vasquez Tom. 2. Disp. 216. N. 60. saith [*Licet concederemus hoc fuisse Apostolorum praeceptum, nihilominus Ecclesia & summus Pontifex potuerunt illud iustis de causis abrogare. Neque enim maior fuit potestas Apostolorum, quam Ecclesia & Pontificis inferendis praeceptis*] That is [Though we should grant that this was a precept of (the Apostles, nevertheless the Church and the Pope might upon just causes abrogate it: For [the power of the Apostles was not greater then that of the Church, and Pope in making precepts.]

The Council of Trent say, Sess. 21. c. 1. 2. that [This power was alway in the Church, that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it might ordain or change things as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the receiver.] (So that they may change any thing that God appointeth about Sacraments, except the substance: And it were well if they would have left that unchanged.)

The Council of Constance took the cup from the Laity [*Licet in primitiva Ecclesia huiusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie.*] Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received of the faithful under both kinds.] So that they confess they contradict the Primitive Church.

Bellarmino plainly saith li. 4. de Pontif. c. 5. [*Si Papa erraret in precipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona & virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.*] That is [If the Pope should erre in commanding vices, and forbidding virtues, the Church were bound to believe that vices are good, and vertues bad,

bad, unless they would sin against conscience.] And against *Barelays* cap. 31. he saith [*In bono sensu dedit Christus Petro Potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, & de non peccato, peccatum*] That is [In a good sense Christ hath given power to Peter to make sin no sin, and no sin to be sin.] (compare this doctrine with the Fathers.)

The *Glosse* in *Can. Lector Dist. 34.* saith, [*Papa dispensat contra Apostolum*] The Pope dispenseth against the Apostle.]

Innocent. 3. Decret. de concess. prebend. tit. 8. c. proposit, saith [*Secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure supra jus possumus dispensare*] According to the fullness of our power we can dispense with the Law above Law.] And the *Glosse* addeth [For the Pope dispenseth against the Apostle, and against the old Testament; as also in vows and oaths] And another *Glosse* saith [The Pope dispenseth with the Gospel, in interpreting it.] More such *Glosses* you may find, if not yet more gross and impious; which I'll not stand to recite.

Gregory de Valentia Tom. 4. disp. 6. qu. 8. p. 5. § 10. saith [*Et certe quadam posterioribus temporibus rectius constituta esse in Ecclesia quam initio se haberent*] That is [And certainly some things are more rightly constituted in the Church in the latter times then they were in the beginning.]

Andradinus Defens. Concil. Trident. lib. 2. pag. (mibi) 236. saith [*Unde etiam liquet minime eos errasse qui dicunt Romanos Pontifices posse nunquam in legibus dispensare a Paulo, primisque quatuor Conciliis ad Ecclesiam exornandam, moresque componendos pro temporum necessitate edictis, qualis est illa que interdicat, ut digamos creari ne liceat Episcopos.*] i. e. [Whence it

it appeareth that they did not erre who say that the Pope of *Rome* may sometime dispense with Lawes made by *Paul* and the four first Councils for the necessity of the times to the adoring of the Church and the composing of manners; such as is that, which forbiddeth, those to be made Bishops who are the husbands of two wives.]

Cardinal *Perron* against King *James li. 2. Obser. 3. c. 3. p. 674.* hath a Chapter purposely [Of the Authority of the Church to alter matters contained in the Scriptures] And *pag. 1109. & 1113.* he saith, that [When in the form of the Sacraments some great inconveniencies are met withal, the Church may therein dispense and alter.] And that the Lords words [Drink yee all of it] were a precept not immutable nor in dispensable] for [the Church hath judged that there may be a dispensation for it.]

Bzovius Observ. on C. 24. constit. Apost. saith [*Eccllesia Romana quae Apostolica utens potestate, singula pro conditione temporum in melius mutat*] i.e. [The Church of *Rome*, using Apostolical power, doth according to the condition of times change all things for the better.]

Cardinal *Tolet* saith [*Cum certum sit non omnia quae Apostoli instituerunt jure Divino esse instituta*] i.e. [It is certain that all things which the Apostles instituted were not instituted by Divine right.]

And the Council of *Trent* hath shewed its usurpation of power above Scripture, in dispensing with the degrees of Marriage in *Lev. 18. & 20.* adding to what God hath prohibited, and relaxing what God hath restrained, and that [To Great Princes and for a publique cause] When they make it sin to other men. These

These and many more of their gross sayings and usurpations against Scripture and above it: they have been long ago told of by Jewell, Reynolds, Whittakers, Molinam, and others; and how sleight their evasions are, the considerate and impartial may discern.

I have therefore recited thus much of their words here, that you may compare them with the Ancients, and then see who are the Changlings and Novelists, and who they be that keep to the old Church and Religion.

And among other ancient Writers I would desire you, (besides all the forecited) to compare the Po-

The sum of Vincentius Li-
vinensis adv. Hæres.

pish frame with the Directi-
ons of Vincentius Lirinensis,
which he giveth us for the

discovery of Truth and avoiding heresie, in his book *Contr. Hæres.* Which I the rather mention, because I admire that the Papists should be so immodest as to boast so much of him as if he were on their side. The sum of his advice to avoid heresie, is this. 1^o *Fidem manire Divina legis autoritate.* 2^o *Ecclesia Catholica traditione:* To fortifie our faith. 1. By the Authority of Gods Law. 2. By the Tradition of the Catholike Church. This way he saith he was himself directed to by all the holy Learned men that he enquired of: *Sepe magno studio & summa attentione perquirens a quamplurimis sanctitate & doctrina prestantibus viris quonam modo possem certa quadam & quasi generali ac regulari via Catholica fidei veritatem ab heretica pravitate falsitate discernere, hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus fere retuli* cap. 1.

(Edict.

(Edit. Colon. a. 1613, & pag. 617. Edit. Perionii. Lugd. 1572.) So that we are given to understand by this passage.

1. That this was no private opinion of *Vincentius*, but the common way that was then taken by Holy learned men to discern Truth from Heresie.

2. And note well that he doth not once in all the book direct us to the *Determination*, much less to the *Infallible* determination of the Pope or the *Romane* Church as the way to discern Truth from Heresie. And can any man of common reason that is willing to know the truth, imagine that there is the least probability that *Vincentius* should silence this *Romish* decision, in a Treatise written purposely and onely on that subject, and wherein he undertaketh to give us the full and certain direction to avoid Heresies, if the Church had then been of the *Romanists* opinion? O intolerably forgetful, negligent, delusory man, that would not give us one word of that which is now the foundation of all, and into which our faith must be ultimately resolved! What never a word to tell us that whatsoever the Pope or Clergy of *Rome* are for or against may be known accordingly to be true or false, because he is the infallible Head of the Church and decider of controversies!

3. Observe also that *Vincentius* doth fully and purposely acknowledge the Scripture sufficiency, and never once mention any Traditions as necessary to supply the defects of Scripture, or as part of Gods word when Scripture is but the other part. Not a word of such Traditions. But onely of Tradition subordinate to Scripture *finaliter* for the true ex-

pounding of them. Hear himself [Cap. 2. *Hic forsitan requirat aliquis: cum sit perfectus scripturarum Canon, sibi que ad Omnia satis superque sufficiat, quid opus est ut ei Ecclesiastica intelligentia iungatur authoritas? Quia videlicet scripturam sacram propria sua altitudine non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt.*] And in his recapitulation Cap. 41. [Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper esse hodie Catholicorum consuetudinem, ut fidem veram duobus his modis approbent. Primum divini Canonis auctoritate: deinde Ecclesia Catholica Traditione: Non quia Canon solus non sibi ad universa sufficiat; sed quia verba Divina pro suo plerique arbitrato interpretantes varias opiniones erroresque concipiant.]

So that Scripture is sufficient ad omnia, ad universa, onely the Churches tradition, that is, interpretation is the safe way to avoid heresie, for the understanding of it.

4 Note also that the Catholike Church which Vincentius mentioneth is not the *Romane* Church any more then any other: but the Tradition that he referreth us to is, that which hath been taught or held *ubique, semper, & ab omnibus*: every where, alwayes, and by all.

5 Note also that it is not any authoritative Determination, of any person or persons whomsoever: but universal consent that he referreth us to.

6. And it is not in lesser, probable, or controverted points: but in those great necessary points, which the Church hath wholly, every where, in all ages agreed in.

7. Note diligently, that one of the cases he putteth is this, cap. 4. [*Quid si, novella aliqua con-*

sagio

tagio non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur?] i. e. [But what if any novel contagion, shall not onely stain a small part of the Church, but also the whole Church?] A presumptuous Question in the Papists sence! But what saith he to it? doth he say, it is impossible? no but [*Tunc item providebit, ut Antiquitati inhaerent: quae prorsus jam non potest ab ulla novitatis fraude seduci*] i. e. Then let him see that he stick to antiquity, which cannot at all now be seduced by any fraud of novelty.] Here 1. he supposeth that the present Church may all erre; 2. He makes the remedy to be an appeal to the ancient Church, and not as the Papists, to appeal in all cases to the present Church or Pope. (*Costerius* seeks by a citation out of *Tertullian* in his Annot. to detort both.)

8. Lastly note diligently, that it is not in all cases that *Vincentius* leadeth us to the exposition of the Church and Fathers, but onely (as in the weighty use before said so) in case of [the newness of errors, when they first arise: before they falsifie the Rules of the ancient faith *], let them be forbidden by the straights of time; and before by the large spreading of the poison they endeavor to vitiate the volumes of our Ancestors:

* That is, before they corrupt ancient Writers or grow so old as to pretend to antiquity themselves.

But dilated and inveterate heresies are to be set upon this way, because by the long tract of time, they have had a long occasion of stealing truth (that is, Antiquity and other signs of truth.) And therefore as for all those Ancient prophaneesses of schismes or heresies, we must by no means convince them, but by the onely authority of Scripture, if there be need,

or avoid them as certainly already of old convicted and condemned by the General Councils of Catho- like Priests.] They are his own words translated, pag. 677. Edit. Perionii, & pag. 87, 88. Edit. Colon. 1613.

So that you see *Vincentius* supposeth error may infect all the Church, and may grow old and so seem to be the Truth, and in such cases onely Scripture must be pleaded against it, unless also we can produce some ancient Council that hath condemned it. This is the very case between us and the Papists: Their heresies are old, and far spread, though not universal nor of utmost antiquity: therefore between us and them the Scripture only must be pleaded. Where there is no need of a judge by reason of its plainness we need not go to the Ancient Church; where there is need of an Expositor, we are content to deal with them on *Vincentius* grounds, and to admit of that which *ubique, semper & ab omnibus* hath been held in point of faith, if they will do the like; And indeed this is our very Religion. Will the Papists but dispute their cause with us on these terms, we shall readily joyn issue with them, and doubt not of a good success. Of this see more in our *Conradus Bergius Prax. Cathol. divin. Canonis.*

The



THe Dispute which we have hitherto managed being only against Popery in the gross, and two or three branches of it onely in particular, I had thought to have annexed a Brief enumeration of the particular errors of the Papists, that the vulgar might observe and avoid them; and therein I thought to have endeavored the true stating of the differences between us, both for the avoiding of error on the other extream, and also that we may take out of the Papists hands the greatest of all their advantages against us, which is the false-opposed opinions and unsound Arguments of such as thus erre on the other side: But perceiving how it would lengthen this work beyond the intended limits, and how certainly all those that so run into extreams would fall a quarrelling with me for not stating the controversies according to their fancies, I have thought best for answering all my ends at cheaper rates to give you the chief of the Popish errors in the words of Doctor *Field*, and to that end to transcribe his seventh Chapter of the third Book; that so the simple Reader may have some help to inform him without a commixed means to pervert him. And for those that desire to see the Protestant Doctrine solidly defended, and cannot have time to read many books, I know not of any one that they may more profitably and safely read to that end then the said Book of Doctor *Field* on the Church; and especially the Appendix to the third part, which is

but the Defence of this very Chapter, proving its particulars, that the Western Church was Protestant and not Popish even in the worst times before *Luthers* Reformation; and that the Papists were but a seducing tyrannical party in the Church, endeavoring to obtrude their errors against the mind of the generality of good men: In which he hath quite broken down those pretences of *Universality* and [*All the Church*] which the Papists do so fondly boast in.



Dr. Feild of the Church,
li. 3. Cap. 7.

Of the several points of difference between us
 and our adversaries, wherein some in the
 Church erred, but not the whole
 Church.

FOr neither did that Church, wherein our Fathers
 lived and dyed, hold that Canon of Scripture,
 which the Romanists now urge; nor that insufficiency
 they now charge it with; nor corruption of the Originals,
 nor necessity of following the vulgar Translation;
 nor the Heresies touching mans creation brought
 into the Church by certain barbarous Schoolmen, as
 that there are three different estates of men; the first
 of pure nature, without addition of Grace, or sin;
 and two other, the one of Grace, the other of Sin:
 That all those evils that are found in the nature of
 man, since his fall, as Ignorance, Concupiscence,
 Contrariety between the better and meaner faculties of
 the Soul, difficulty to do well, and proneness to do evil,
 were all natural, the conditions of pure nature, that
 is, of nature, as considered in it self, it would come
 forth from God: That these evils are not sinful, nor
 had their beginnings from sin, that they were the con-
 sequents

sequents of nature in the state of creation, but restrained by addition of supernatural Grace, without which the integrity of nature was full and perfect: That men in the state of pure nature, that is, as they might have been created of God in the integrity of Nature, without addition of Grace, and in the estate of Original sin, differ no otherwise, but as they that never had, and they that have lost rich and precious cloathing; so that Original sin is but the loss of that, without which natures integrity may stand: That no evils are brought in by the fall, but nature left to her self to feel that which was before, but not felt, nor discerned while the addition of Grace bettered nature: None of these errors, touching the estate of mans creation, were the Doctrines of the Church, but the private fancies and conceits of men.

So likewise touching Original Sin, there were that taught, that it is not interent in each particular man born of Adam, but that Adams personal sin is imputed onely: That the propagation of sin is not general, Mary being conceived without Original sin: That the punishment of it is not any sensible smart, or positive evil, but privative onely; and that therefore there is a third place, neither Hell, nor Heaven, named, Limbus Puerorum; which is a place, whereas some think, they who are condemned thither, though they be excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven, and all possibility of ever coming thither, yet are in a state of natural happiness, and do enjoy the sweet content of Eternal Life. These Pelagian Heresies were taught in the Church of God, but they were not the Doctrines of the Church; being condemned, rejected and refuted

fated, as contrary to the Christian Verity, by many worthy members and guides of the Church: who as they never received these parts of false Doctrine: So likewise the Church wherein they lived, neither knew, nor approved that distinction and difference of venial and mortal sins, which the Romanists now Teach, nor power of nature to do the works of the Law according to the substance of the things commanded, though not according to the intention of the Law-giver to love God above all, and to do actions morally good, or not sinful, without concurrence of special Grace, nor election and reprobation depending on the foresight of something in us positive or privative; nor merit of congruence and condignity; nor works of supererogation; nor counsels of perfection, as they now teach; nor justification by perfection of inherent qualities; nor uncertainty of Grace; nor seven Sacraments properly so named, nor local presence; nor Transubstantiation; nor oral manducation of the body of Christ, nor real sacrificing of it for the quick and the dead: nor remission of sins after this Life; nor tormenting of the souls of men dying in the state of Salvation in a part of Hell, hundreds of years, by Devils in corporal fire (out of which, prayer should deliver them) nor that the Saints hear our Prayers, nor are acquainted with our particular wants: nor the gross idolatry in those times committed, and intollerable abuses found in the number, fashion, and worship of their images: nor their absolution, as now they define it: nor treasure of the Church growing out of the superfluity of Saints merits, nor rewardable in themselves, to be disposed by the Pope for the supply of other mens wants to release them

out of Purgatory by way of indulgence: nor the infallibility of the Popes judgement, and plenitude of his power such and so great that he may depose Princes, and dispose of their Crowns, and dignities, and that whatsoever he doth he may not be brought into order, or deposed by authority of the whole world in a general Council.

These are the errors which we condemn and our adversaries maintain and defend: these we are all assured were not the Doctrines of that Church wherein our Fathers lived and dyed, though we do not deny, but they were taught by some in that Church. All these we offer to prove to be error in matter of our Christian faith, and that seeing we could have peace no longer with our adversaries, but by approving these impieties, we had just cause to divide our selves from them, or (to speak more properly) to suffer our selves to be accursed, anathematized, and rejected by them, rather then to subscribe to so many errors, and heresies, contrary to the Christian, and Catholike verity.

Where-



WHereas the Papists have little else to say to us, but onely to call still for a Catalogue of Professors to prove the successive visibilty of our Church; we require of them first an answer to those Writings that have been extant so long on this subject: especially Bishop *Usher de successione & Statu Eccles.* and his answer to the Jesuits challenge (Defended by Master *Sing* and Master *Pustock*) Doctor *Fields* Treat. of the Church, especially the Appendix to the third part: *Simon Birkbecks* Protestants evidence: Doctor *Whites* Way to the true Church. *Abbos* against *Hill. Illiricus* his Catalogues *testinum veritatis*. *Mornays* two Treatises of the Church, and the Mystery of iniquity (to say nothing of that of the Mass) *Johan. Lidii Waldens.* *Nicol. Vignier Ecclesiast. Histor.* And the confessions of your own Writers: Your after Pope *Aeneas Sylvius Histor. Bohem.* and that commonly cited passage of your inquisitor *Rainerius*, which I will adjoyn.

Rainerius contr. Waldens. cap 4. Inter omnes sectas quae adhuc sunt & fuerunt, non est perniciosior Ecclesiae quam ea Leonistarum, idque tribus de causis. 1. Quia est diuturnior: aliqui enim dicunt quod duravit a tempore Silvestri: alii a tempore Apostolorum. 2. Quia est generalior: fere enim nulla terra est in qua haec secta non sit. 3. Quia cum omnes aliae sectae immanitate Blasphemiarum in Deum audientibus horrorem inducant; haec scilicet Leonistarum magna habet speciem pietatis, eo quod coram omnibus iuste vivant, & bene omnia de Deo credant, & omnes articulos qui in
(ym-

Symbolo continentur : solummodo Romanam Ecclesiam blasphemant et Clerum.

That is [Among all the Sects that yet are and have been there is not a more pernicious to the Church then that of the Lyonists ; and that for three causes. 1. Because it is the more ancient (or of longer continuance) for some say that it hath endured from the time of *Silvester* ; others from the time of the Apostles. 2. Because it is more general, for there is scarce any land in which this sect is not. 3. Because, when all other sects do by the immanity of their blasphemy bring horror into the hearers ; this of the Lyonists hath a great shew of godliness ; in that they live righteously before all men, and they believe all things well concerning God, and all the articles that are contained in the Creed : onely they blaspheme the *Romane Church*, and the Clergy.

To this adde what I cited out of *Canns* and others before.

Lastly, Give us some tolerable answer to all that voluminous evidence of your oppositions, by Princes, Prelates, Divines and Lawyers, which *Mich. Goldastus* hath collected and published, on his *volumes de Monarchie & constitut. Imperial.*



APPENDIX.

A Translation of Bishop Downnames Catalogue
of Popish Errors. *lib. 3. de Antichristo cap. 7.*

To satisfie the earnest desires of some of the un-learned, who would fain know wherein the Papists differ from us, that they may be the better furnished against them, and may the better understand those that under other Titles carry about their doctrines.

BEcause I find many ignorant persons both unacquainted with the Errors of the Papists, and yet very desirous to know them, I have adventured to translate a larger Catalogue of them, gathered by Bishop George Downname in his Book written to prove the Pope Antichrist *lib. 3. cap. 7. pag. 189. &c.* though it cannot be expected that in such brief expressions, the true point of the

Because many of these Errors are delivered onely by particular Doctors, and all be not of a mind as to the sence, and some of the words may admit a tolerable and Orthodox meaning, I thought meet to adde these Animadversions, to acquaint you in what sence we reject them. What I pass by with-diffe-

out *Animadversion*,
I leave upon them as it
is here charged; and
also suppose the diffe-
rence to lie plain.

difference, should in all lie
plain, before them that are
unacquainted with the con-
troversies, yet because I was
resolved not to give you any
such Catalogue of my own
gathering, and knew not where to find one so large
as to the number of errors, and brief as to the ex-
pressions, I give you this as I find it.

Bishop



Bishop G.D. Chap. 7. A Catalogue of the Errors
of the Church of *Rome*.

THe Errors of the Papists are either about the Principles of Divinity or the parts of it. The principles of Theology are the Holy Scriptures : Here the Papists have many errors.

1. They deny the Holy Scripture which is of Divine inspiration to be the onely Rule, and Foundation of Faith.

1. *That is, as the Authentick sign of Gods Will : For we all*

confess that Christ and his Apostles are the foundation of faith, as the Authorized chief revealers ; and God himself onely as the principal efficient, and Christ the Mediator as the first corner stone of the matter revealed ; and the Catholike Church, as the keeper or subject in quo of true Belief : for the Law is written in the hearts of its members, and it is the Pillar and ground or foundation of truth.

2. They take certain Apocryphal Books into the Canon of the old Testament, which neither the Jewish Synagogue (to which the Oracles of God were committed) nor yet the purer Christian Church did receive.

3. They

3. *This error is one of the fundamentals of the Romish Fabrike.*

3. They make two parts of Gods word, that is, the Scriptures, and (their own) Traditions.

4. They contend that the Customes and unwritten Opinions of the Church of *Rome*, are most certain Apostolical Traditions.

5. These Traditions, or (as they call them) unwritten verities, they make equal with the Holy Scripture, and receive and reverence them with equal pious affection and reverence.

6. *When yet it is most clearly proved by many, especially Blondel in a just volume, that abundance of them are forgeries; and Dalaus proves it particularly of the Clementines.*

6. They number the Popes Decretal Epistles with the holy Scriptures.

7. *At least quoad nos, So that they never know when their faith is at its full stature.*

7. They say its heresie for any to say, that it is not altogether in the Power of the Church or Pope to appoint Articles of faith.

8. *By this you may conjecture from whence the Quakers have their doctrine of the light within us.*

8. They prefer the faith and judgement of the Church of *Rome*, which they say is the internal Scripture written by the hand of God in heart of the Church, before the Holy Scripture.

fore the Holy Scripture.

9. *It is the voice of the Law giver and the Law is the Rule of life and of judgement.*

9. That the Scripture in which God himself speaketh is not the voice of a Judge, but the matter of strife.

10. They

10. They accuse the Scripture (which is the light to our feet, and giveth understanding to children) of too much obscurity.

pervert as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction: But we maintaine that they have so much light as sufficeth to their ends. that is, to be the Rule of our faith and life.

11. They condemn it also of imperfection and insufficiency.

10. *We confess (as Peter saith of Pauls Epistles) that there are somethings in them hard to be understood, which the ignorant*

11. *This is one of their greatest errors.*

12. They say that even in matters of faith, and the worship of God, we cannot argue Negatively from Scripture (as thus: It is not in the Scripture: therefore it is not necessary or lawful)

13. That the Scripture is not sufficient for the refuting of all heresies (as if there were any heresie but what is against Scripture.)

14. That heresie is not so much to be defined by the Scripture authority as by the Churches determination.

15. That the authority of the Catholike Church (that is, the *Romane*) is greater then of the Scriptures: and the Popes authority greater then the Church.

15. *The last clause (that the Popes authority is greater then the Churches) the French do not hold. And so they are divided in their foundation.*

16. That the Church is ancienter than the Scripture (that is, then the word of God which is now written because

16. *They yeld that the Doctrine is elder then the Church, and we yeld that the*

Church is elder then writings. But we affirme that the doctrine as fetcht from these writings is now before the present Church in order of nature, as the cause of it, at least as to the generality of members.

17. The Negative is their master error: but the Affirmative Proposition is not denyed of us as to every kind of dependance, but of some special sorts, of which I have spoken in the Pref. to the Saints Rest Part. 2. Edit. 2. &c.

18. The height of Romish arrogancy
18. Also that the sence of the Scripture is to be sought from the See of Rome, and that the Scripture is not the word of God, but as it is expounded according to the sence of the Church of Rome.

19. They make seven Principles of the Christian doctrine, which are all grounded in the authority of the See and Pope of Rome.

20. And yet I would that vulgar Translation might but be allowed to be the deciding tale: for there is enough in it against them.
20. They take the vulgar Translation only for authentic, preferring it before the originals (though it is so manifestly corrupt that the Copies lately published by the Popes themselves,

Sixth
places
21.
Scrip
Trans
tongu
must
read
perm
read
foul
me
Chur

The

Ma

Th

t.

Sixtus the fifth and *Clement* the eighth do in many places differ.

21. That either the holy Scriptures ought not to be Translated into vulgar tongues; or if it be, yet it must neither be publickly read in a known tongue, nor permitted to be privately read by the common people.

21. *This error is an accusation of the Wisdom of God, and contrary to express Scripture, and destructive to the progress of knowledge and godliness, and such as the experience of gracious souls*

should provoke them to detest; and had they but this one, they could never expect that the Catholike Church should unite upon their principles.

§ 2. Of the Belief.

The Parts of Theology are

1. Of faith, or things to be believed.
2. Of Charity, or things to be done.

Matters of faith are

1. Of God & his works.
2. Of the Church.

The works of God are specially

1. Of Creation and Government of the world.
2. Of Redemption of mankind.

1. **A** Bout the Creation the Papists erre in

1. *As concupiscence is taken improperly for*
Cc 2 say-

the corrupted sensitive appetite; so it was of God: But as it signifieth the appetite dis-tempered or corrupted, or the corruption of the will, inclining it to evil, it is not of God.

2. See Rada's first controversy.

(created after Gods Image in Righteousness and holiness.

3. *A posse mori, and a posse non mori were not then Natural: But a non posse mori, or an actual non mori were to be the reward of obedience; and is now given by Christ. And a non posse non mori, or an actual death, are the fruits of sin.*

4, 5. *I would they would prove this Tradition to be Apostolical.*

were fifteen cubits higher then the highest mountains.)

5. Forsooth they would have that Paradise (or Eden) yet untouched, that it may be a pleasant habitation to *Henoch* and *Elias*, yet living in mortal bodies (where they place them as behind the stage, that they may be ready to act their parts in the fable of Antichrist)

saying that concupiscence was then natural to man (though *John* saith that it is not of God, 1st Jo. 2. 16. and themselves sometime confess it to be evil and contrary to nature.

2. In the denying that original righteousness was natural to man before the fall

3. In affirming that mortality was natural to man before the fall (which yet is not from God the author of nature.)

4. In placing Paradise where the waters of the flood did not reach it (which yet covered all the earth, and

To the Article of creation is annexed the Article of providence.

1. In this the Papists erre, in making mans actions not to depend on Gods Providence, but on mans Free-will, which they make the absolute Lord of its own actions.

1. In this they no more agree among themselves then with us.

2. And that they are not determined of God (according to whose determinate Council things come to pass *Act. 2. 30. & 4. 28.*) but that God rather (who worketh all according to the Council of his will) doth follow the determination of the will of man.

2. Saith Davenant, the point of Pre-determination is a controversie between the Dominicans and Jesuites, which Protestants have no mind to trouble themselves with: But they that do are not of a mind in it, no more then they.

3. And that he foreknows them from eternity only in mans will.

4. Also in that they interpret the action of God as judge, punishing sin with sin, hardening men, giving them over to their lusts, and to the temptations of Satan, to be naked permission (as if the judge or Magistrate might not deliver a malefactor to the hangman, as executioner of his judgement to be punished; but

4. God doth not cause sin even when it is a punishment; but onely permitteth it; But by such a permission as proceedeth from a punishing intention. And so he justly withholdeth his grace, and giveth men over to the power of the devil & their own lusts

the corrupted sensitive appetite ; so it was of God : But as it signifieth the appetite dis-tempered or corrupted, or the corruption of the will, inclining it to evil, it is not of God.

2. See Rada's first controversy.

(created after Gods Image in Righteousness and holiness.

3. *A posse mori, and a posse non mori were not then Natural : But a non posse mori, or an actual non mori were to be the reward of obedience ; and is now given by Christ. And a non posse non mori, or an actual death, are the fruits of sin.*

4, 5. *I would they would prove this Tradition to be Apostolical.*

were fifteen cubits higher then the highest mountains.)

5. Forsooth they would have that Paradise (of Eden) yet untouched, that it may be a pleasant habitation to *Henoch* and *Elias*, yet living in mortal bodies (where they place them as behind the stage, that they may be ready to act their parts in the fable of Antichrist)

saying that concupiscence was then natural to man (though *John* saith that it is not of God, 1st Jo. 2. 16. and themselves sometime confess it to be evil and contrary to nature.

2. In the denying that original righteousness was natural to man before the fall

3. In affirming that mortality was natural to man before the fall (which yet is not from God the author of nature.)

4. In placing Paradise where the waters of the flood did not reach it (which yet covered all the earth, and

To the Article of creation is annexed the Article of providence.

1. In this the Papists erre, in making mans actions not to depend on Gods Providence, but on mans Free-will, which they make the absolute Lord of its own actions.

1. In this they no more agree among themselves then with us.

2. And that they are not determined of God (according to whose determinate Council things come to pass *Act. 2. 30. & 4. 28.*) but that God rather (who worketh all according to the Council of his will) doth follow the determination of the will of man.

2. Saith Davenant, the point of Pre-determination is a controversie between the Dominicans and Jesuites, which Protestants have no mind to trouble themselves with: But they that do are not of a mind in it, no more then they.

3. And that he foreknows them from eternity only in mans will.

4. Also in that they interpret the action of God as judge, punishing sin with sin, hardening men, giving them over to their lusts, and to the temptations of Satan, to be naked permission (as if the judge or Magistrate might not deliver a malefactor to the hangman, as executioner of his judgement to be punished; but

4. God doth not cause sin even when it is a punishment; but onely permitteth it; But by such a permission as proceedeth from a punishing intention. And so he justly withholdeth his grace, and giveth men over to the power of the devil & their own lusts

should not onely permit him to be punished, that is, not hinder it.

§ 3. Of Redemption.

IN the Doctrine of Redemption and Salvation we must consider.

1. Whence we are redeemed, to wit from sin, and a state of obstinacy

2. By whom, to wit, by Christ, who is the author and foundation of our Salvation.

3. By what means the benefit of Redemption and Salvation is applyed to us: where, of the Covenant of God, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

4. The effects of Gods Grace in Christ, or the degrees of Salvation, which are fruits of the Merits of Christ applyed to us.

In all these the Papists do filthily erre; for as to sin (which intercedeth between the works of Creation and Redemption, as a medium) they teach.

1. That the blessed Virgin was free from all sin original and actual, as being conceived without Original sin, and having lived without actual sin.

2. Under the name of the flesh which lusteth against the Spirit, and is to be mortified among other things, they mean the body of man.

2. *The body is not to be mortified by self-murder; but the corrupt inclinations and actions of the sensitive appetite are to be mortified; and all its motions subjected to holy Reason: And this is called in Scripture the mortifying of the flesh, and our corruption would never be called in Scripture so often [The flesh and the body] if it were not*

3. That

that the fleshy appetite is much of the seat of it, and the pleasing of that appetite and imagination, much of the end (that I say not the whole.)

3. That all sin is not a transgression of the Law (John defineth it, 1. Jo. 3. 4. Gal. 3. 10.) nor all transgression of the Law is sin.

4. That there is no sin but what is voluntary (which is not onely false of concupiscence, habitual and actual which goes before the wills consent, but of other sins also which are done of ignorance or infirmity, for though the actions are voluntary by which they are committed, yet the sin is not.)

4. Sins are called voluntary, either because they are in the Will, or from the Will. In the first sence the vicious habits of the Will are voluntary in the second, the ellicite and imperate acts. Also they are voluntary, directly, and formally, as are the wills owne acts and habits;

or participative, as are the acts and habites of all the imperate faculties. And there is nothing sin but what is voluntary in one of these senses: nor any further then voluntary.

Sin is original or actual: The Papists marvailously xtenuate original sin, and amplifie and set forth the strength of nature.

5. For some of them would have original sin to be only the guilt of Adams transgression: most will have it to be onely the want of O-

riginal righteousness: And so that the state of man after Adams fall, and in pure naturals, doth differ

5. Neither they nor we are agreed about the quiddity of original sin.

onely as a stript man, and a naked man.

6. Others would have it to be a very small sin, and less then any venial sin; and therefore needeth no repentance; nor is punished with pain of sense, but onely with pain of loss.

7. Others deny original sin to be properly sin, or that any thing is found in infants that properly hath the nature of sin.

8. *Metaphors are not usually the fittest terms to state controversies in. We have vicious habits and the absence of Rectifying habits: call this what you will. Free will is either Physical (and*

that all men have as they are men) or moral; which is 1. To be free from a legal restraint from good (and this all have) or to be free from vicious Habits: and this onely the sanctified have; and that but in part.

9. *It is the most noble controversie among the Schoolemen: and*

Thomists, and the

greatest part seem rather to erre on the other extreame, and the Scotists that hold this to rectifie them, do give such explications of their doctrine, as are well worth our study, as you may see in Rada's first controversie.

10. *Mans Will is the Ruler of it self under God: and its fully free from that necessity*

8. That we are not by nature dead in sin but sick: nor do they acknowledge in us an impotency to spiritual good, but a difficulty: nor that Free will to spiritual good is wholly taken from us, but hindered and tyed.

9. That men are naturally inclined to love God above all.

10. They attribute to man a will that is the Ruler and Lord of it self: such as belongeth to no creature: Yea they

they say that the will of man is as free from Necessity as the Will of God.

11. They deny the will of the unregenerate to be a servant.

12. They deny also that all the works of the unregenerate are sins: or that the unregenerate sin when they do the works that are commanded.

13. They say that before all grace a man hath freewill not onely to works natural and moral, but also to works of piety, and supernat-
ural.

vil as evil. For these were but slavery. 3. Nor is it free from the moral force of a darke and erring judgment. 4. Nor from temptations. 5. Nor from its own vicious disposition, till grace free it. But its free,
1. *From any natural determination to evil, or to unknown good in particular. 2 And free from coaction or violence. 3. And from a physical efficient immediate exterior Determiner, in ordinary natural, or sinful actions. 4. And its free from sinful habites in that measure as it is sanctified.*

14. That there is in mans free will, not onely a possibility or passive power, but

which is contrary to its natural essential Liberty.

11 *It is a willful servant onely.*

12. *The matter of their works is oft good: but because their end and manner is alwayes wrong, therefore they sin in all: for bonum est ex causis integris.*

13. *The will is free and not free in several senses. 1. It is not free from Gods Government. 2. Nor from its natural inclination to good in general; and therefore cannot will e-*

vil as evil. For these were but slavery. 3. Nor is it free from the moral force of a darke and erring judgment. 4. Nor from temptations. 5. Nor from its own vicious disposition, till grace free it. But its free,
1. *From any natural determination to evil, or to unknown good in particular. 2 And free from coaction or violence. 3. And from a physical efficient immediate exterior Determiner, in ordinary natural, or sinful actions. 4. And its free from sinful habites in that measure as it is sanctified.*
14. *No question but the will is potentia activa naturalis, or also*

hath such an active power : which is im-
 ployed in spirituals
 when it is inclined by a habit thereto ; but till then will
 not act spiritually : not because the natural faculty is
 absent, but because the inclination without which it
 will not act, is absent.

15. No doubt but un-
 der the common grace
 of Christ, an unre-
 generate man may do
 that which he shall be more disposed to conversion by then
 else he would have been : as our practical Divines
 all teach, and we are fain daily to preach it to our peo-
 ple : or else we shall make but ill work with them.

16. Many by con-
 gruous merit do mean
 no more then the fore-
 said aptitude compara-
 tive to others.

17. This also some
 Protestants hold : But
 no wicked man ever
 did his best.

18. There is a com-
 mon grace whose effica-
 cy is laid on the will,
 as Adams was ; And
 a special which shall infallibly bow and change the
 will.

19. A self-contradiction : to deserve par-
 don.

also an active power to spiri-
 tual works.

15. That the unregenerate
 can prepare and dispose
 themselves to justification.

16. That a wicked man by
 doing his best may congru-
 ously merit the grace of
 justification.

17. God necessarily gi-
 veth grace to him that doth
 his best.

18. That the efficacy of
 preventing grace dependeth
 on the freedome of the will.

19. That every transgres-
 sion of the Law (which
 yet pronounceth every man

accursed

accursed that continueth not in all things commanded in the Law to do them) deserveth not death : But that there are many sins of themselves, and of their own nature venial, and deserving pardon.

20. That charity is not violated by venial sins, and that they are not against Gods precepts, but besides them.

20. *Some sin is but consequentially against love; and other sin directly, but all is against Gods Laws.*

21. That the blood of Christ is not necessary to wash them away, but that they may be done away by Holy Water, knocking the brest, Episcopal benediction, and other ridiculous means.

21. *Who ever denyeth that sin may be done away without Christs blood doth know little of sin or Christ.*

22. That sin is called mortal because it brings death upon the soul, that is, depriveth it of Gods grace.

22. *Mortal sin, 1. As to merit, is all sin: 2. As to signification, symptomatically, it is all sin in-*

consistent with regeneration. 3. Effectually it is all that eventually kills: which is in several degrees and sorts.

23. And they teach that by every mortal sin, grace is lost and charity expectorated.

24. That this mortal sin is any that shall obtain the wills consent, though the act be not performed.

25. That the sins of the regenerate are in the same fence mortal, even those committed of ignorance and infirmity.

26. And that it is such a mortal sin to neglect or not

26. *O unmerciful men! that will dig so ob-*

many pits then to entrap poor souls in mortal sin.

27, 28. *Many of the ancients also were of this mind: of which see my Treat. against infidelity Part. 3.*

28. Nor that its impossible for him that commits that sin to be renewed by Repentance.

observe any Ecclesiastical law, or tradition of the Roman Church.

27. That the sin against the Holy Ghost is not unpardonable.

§ 4. Of Christ.

IN Christ are considerable, 1. His Person, 2. His Office. About his Person he erreth who thinks not rightly of his Godhead, or of his Manhood.

1. About Christs Godhead those Papists erre that deny Christ to be *αὐτοθεος* God of himself, for thats as much as to deny him to be *Jehovah*.

About the Humane Nature, both Soul and Body they erre.

2. *Of this see the writings between Dr. Hammond and Mr. Jeanes: many Schoolmen say otherwise.*

2. For they deny that the soul of Christ did increase in wisdom and grace (which Luke expressly affirmeth) *Luk. 2. 52.*

3. Or that he was ignorant of the day and hour of the last judgement (which yet himself confesseth, *Mat. 13. 32.*)

4. They seem to give him a phantastick body that neither consisteth of dimensions, nor occupieth a place, which when he was born did not open the wombe

wombe of his mother, and when he rose did penetrate the stone of the sepulchre, and when he instituted his Supper, lay hid under the Species of Bread and Wine.

5. Yea that they may establish that monstrous opinion of Transubstantiation, they feign him to have a body that can neither be seen, nor felt, nor circumscribed, that is in innumerable places at once: which is not made of the substance of the blessed Virgin, but of bread (as wine of that water, *Joh. 2. 9.*) and which sustaineth the accidents of bread (as their subject) For they can devise no other subject after the transubstantiation of the bread: Whence it follows, that they are no more accidents of bread but of Christs body.

6. And as to Christs Office, they teach that Christ is Mediator onely according to his humane nature.

7. They deny Christ to be the onely Mediator of intercession but joyn with him Angels and Saints.

8. They teach that we must pray to Saints to intercede for us.

9. That we are heard by the Saints suffrages and Merits.

10. They deny Christ to be the onely Prophet, whose voice onely must be heard, spiritual King, and Priest of the New Testament.

6,7. Saints on earth must intercede under Christ for others, especially Pastors whose office it is. And we may pray them to pray for us: But not the Saints departed.

10. All Pastors of the Church do hold their office in a subordination to Christs Prophetical Office: And many a Prophet there hath been under Christ: But none that hath the
But

Office of being the universal infallible Teacher of the Church as the Pope would be.

But they make the Pope also the chief Prophet and Pastor, King and Monarch, and Priest. Whence it follows that the Pope is not onely opposed to Christ as his adversary, but as his Rival.

11. *All Christians are Priests to God, to offer up spiritual sacrifice, metaphorically so called: And Pastors offer up Christ Representatively, Commemoratively and Sacramentally, but not really. The name Priest is not worth contending about.*

11. And they make other sacrificing Priests also of the New Testament, having an external visible Priesthood, and that according to the order of Melchizedeck: whose office it is to sacrifice Christ again and offer him to his Father.

12. That the (unchangeable) Priesthood of Christ the eternal Priest, is made eternal by the succession of such Priests.

13. That an Eternal Priesthood requireth an Eternal Sacrifice, but is not Eternal, unless it be often sacrificed.

14. That this Eternal sacrifice can be nothing else but the sacrifice of the mass.

15. No doubt but Christ merited the glorifying of his own humane nature: But that was but consequential to his meriting for us.

15. That Christ (who is God over all blessed for ever) did merit for himself, Bellarm. de Christo li. 5. cap. 9.

16. Some of them profess that by merit, they mean but Re-

16. That Christs merits are not the onely meritorious cause of salvation; But they

they hope to be saved by their own and other mens merits. wardableness by promise: *which we maintain.*

§ 5. *Of the outward means.*

Let us now come to the external means, to wit, Gods Covenant, and the administration of the Covenant in the Ministry of the word and Sacraments. The Covenant is twofold, 1. Of works, or the Law. 2. Of Grace, or the Gospel.

1. These two the Papists do almost confound: for they plainly make the Gospel a Covenant of works, and call it the new Law, which prescribes a more perfect obedience than the Law it self, for the obtaining of Justification and Salvation.

1. *Its no Covenant of works in Pauls sense, or as Moses Law was; But humane Actions are its condition. And as all the Ancients use to call it the new Law, so its justly, seeing Christ is the King of the Church and it hath*

the nature of a Law. But the promise is the chief part: and the moral precepts prescribe no other obedience then they did before in nature: But Positives are added.

2. That faith is stirred up, and so sins forgiven by the preaching of the word, they say is a fiction of the Hereticks of our Times.

3. That the Sacraments are not seals of the promises or Covenant of God,

3. *In this they have some new friends among our selves.*

nor

nor instituted to confirm the promise.

4. *So say some Anabaptists.*

5. *I would we could see this in the fruits and proof. But de opere operato they are not themselves agreed of the sence.*

if they put not the Bar of mortal sin.

6. That grace is contained in the Sacraments as in a vessel, nay that the Sacraments are Physical instrumental causes of Grace, and that they do work holiness by a power put into them by God, as the heat of the fire is the cause of the burning of the wood.

7. *His real intention is necessary to make it a lawful administration as to himself, but not to others: but his seeming intention, and their own seeming intention is necessary to the external being of the Sacrament that it be no nullity: And the receivers real intention is necessary to the effects and well being of it to himself.*

8. *It is not the name of a Sacrament that we contend about, but the nature and definition.*

4. That Circumcision was a seal of the Righteousness of faith onely to *Abraham*.

5. That Sacraments of the new Law do confer grace that makes us acceptable, or justifying Grace, *ex opere operato*, i. e. upon that very account, because the external Sacrament is administred,

7. That there is necessarily required the intention of the Administrator to the truth of the Scrament, at least of doing what the Church does.

8. That there are seven Sacraments of the new Covenant instituted by that, neither fewer nor more.

9. That

9. That in the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Order there is imprinted in the Soul by God a Character or certain spiritual and indeleble sign or marke, so that they cannot be re-iterated: In the other Sacraments there is onely an ornament or drefs imprinted in stead of a Character or

9. *They know not what to make of this Character themselves many Schoolmen make it to be but a Relation: And we confess that Baptism, Ordination, &c. do fix us in a Relation to God.*

mark.

10. That the observation of the Ceremonies which they use in the Administration of Sacraments (though invented by themselves) through will-worship is meritorious and part of Divine worship.

10. *They that think it their duty to serve God by such inventions, will easily be drawn to think too Well of their invented Works.*

§ 6. Of Baptism.

1. **T**Hat all Infants before are possessed by the Devil.

1. *By nature all are Satans captives, which exorcism will not deliver us from.*

2. They grant a power to women (even such as are unbaptized themselves) to baptize.)

2. *This error (in case of Necessity) some ancients and Councils held.*

3. That Baptism is not onely necessary, by necessity of

3. *Some of them except those that have*
D d pre.

the totum baptismi : none can be saved without the thing signified in Baptism : but they may without the sign.

4. *There is a ground work laid for the pardon of future sins, but no actual pardon of them.*

5. That the laver of Regeneration is not profitable to those that fall after Baptism.

6. *If the Pope were the head of the Church we must needs be baptized into him.*

7. *How comes it then to appear in all, as soon as they come to age.*

So as that has no

8. *What goes with it in most, before they come to age.*

he is truly and formally justified.

9. *In many things they agree, and in many they differ more then all confess : Of which see Zanchy oft and fully.*

precept (which we confess) but also to be simply necessary to salvation by necessity of means : for none can be saved without Baptism.

4. That the efficacy of Baptism does not extend it self to the future, but onely to that which is past.

6. That there is in Baptism a silent and implicate oath of obedience to the Pope.

7. That no sin remains or is left in the Baptized : for sin is wholly taken away by Baptisme, not onely so that it is not imputed, but being.

8. That Baptisme also does confer grace to the Baptized *ex opere operato* by the work done, by which

9. That the Baptism of John was not the same Sacrament, nor had it the same force and efficacy with the Baptisme which is instituted by Christ ; as if Christ were

not

not the Author of *John's* Baptisme.

10. That after the Baptisme of *John* they must needs receive the Baptisme of Christ.

10. *So the Antients thought, and I think it the safest way.*

11. That the Bells are to be Baptized by the Bishops or Suffragans with a solemn Rite.

11, 12. *Theres no end of humane inventions when once men depart from the Scripture sufficiency and give way to their own self-conceitedness and arrogancy.*

12. They use and urge some unprofitable and superstitious Ceremonies as if they were necessary both before Baptisme and after. For,

1. The Baptized are signed with the sign of the Cross on the forehead, on the brest, on the eyes, on the ears, on the nose, and on the mouth; that all the senses of the body may be guarded with this sign; for by vertue of this *signe*, are the Sacraments compleated, and the Divels stratagems frustrated.

2. They give them hallowed Salt to eat, that being seasoned with wisdom, they might be free from the stink of sin; and may not putrifie again.

3. They play the Conjurers about little children: as if they were such as were pulled out of the hands of the Divil, and they blow the wicked spirit out by their breath, That one spirit may be driven out with another.

4. They touch their nostrils and ears with spittle, saying, *Ephata*, be opened.

5. They anoint them with consecrated oile in the brest, that they may be fortified against the adversary, and he may not be able to perswade them unto unclean and hurtful things: They anoint them also

between the shoulders, that they may receive strength to bear the Lords burden.

After Baptism, they anoint the top of the head of him who is newly Baptized with Crisme or Oyle. After this sacred Unction they cover his head with a holy veil, that he may know himself to enjoy a Kingly and Priestly Diademe. They give him a lighted Taper, that he may be taught thereby to fulfill that Evangelical command, *So let your light shine, &c.*

§ 7. Of Confirmation.

1. **T**HE Sacrament of Confirmation is more worthy then the Sacrament of Baptism, for as it is done by greater Priests (*viz.* Bishops) which cannot be done by less, so also it is to be had and held with greater veneration and reverence.

2. That Confirmation does excel Baptism in regard of its effecting grace to well doing.

3. That the Sacrament of Confirmation does confer Grace making us acceptable, *ex opere operato*, and indeed more then Baptism does

4. In which the fulness of the Holy Ghost is conferred, *viz. ex opere operato*.

5. The matter of this Sacrament is Chrisme, or unction, which they call the Chrisme of Salvation.

6. That by this holy Chrisme made of Oyle and Balsom, and smeered on the forehead in form of a Cross, the sevenfold Spirit of Grace is given.

7. For that the holy Spirit is given to us by Oyle, as it was given to the Apostles in the form of fire.

8. That

8. That he will never be a Christian, that is not by Episcopall Confirmation Chrismated.

9 Instead of Imposition of hands, the Bishop gives him that is confirmed a boxe on the eare, to confirm him forsooth, and to drive away the Devil.

§ 8. *Of the Eucharist.*

1. **I**N the Sacrament of the Eucharist they teach and urge the corporal presence of the flesh of Christ. As if that Sacrament were instituted to nourish bodies and not souls.

2. And that the body and blood of Christ is made really present in the Sacrament by Transubstantiation, or conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the very body of Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into his very blood.

3. That this Transubstantiation is made by reciting the Sacramental words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, This is my body. And therefore they call these operative words.

4. That these words are to be muttered with a low murmuring: as if Christ had spoken them Magically to inchant the Bread, and not to instruct his Disciples.

5. Thus they expound them, This (*i. e.* under these figures) is my body, and yet they urge the literal sense, or τὰ ἑνὸν.

6. That the body of Christ is made of the Bread in the Eucharist as Wine was made of water.

7. And yet that the Priests when they make the Body of Christ of the Bread, do not produce it (*as some will have it*) but do change the substance of the Bread into the very pre existing body.

8. That after the words of consecration, the meer accidents, and indeed all the accidents of the bread and wine do remain.

9. That not so much as the first matter doth remain after the change of the bread.

10. That the substance of the bread is consumed and ceaseth to be and yet is not annihilated.

11. That the substance of the bread ceasing, the substance of the body of Christ succeeds, and is contained under the accidents of the bread.

12. That those accidents are not in any subject, nor do they subsist of themselves, but are upheld by God after a supernatural manner.

13. That they are in somewhat else, but do not inhere in it.

14. That the body of Christ does remain in the host, as long as the accidents of bread remain uncorrupted.

15. That as long as the body of Christ is in the host, It is accompanied with Angels.

16. That in the corruption of the species, there is matter substituted by God, in that very instant in which those species cease to be, and in which something else is Generated.

17. That the subject of these Accidents is quantity, which also it self is an accident, and which they feign to subsist without a *quantum* that hath dimensions.

18. That the Elements of the Sacrament of the Eucharist do not nourish if taken in a great quantity, with-

without a Divine Miracle. And therefore neither do they nourish the mice that take a small quantity without a miracle.

19. But as they take away the substance of the Bread and Wine, and so with that the substance of the Sacrament: so they rob the Body of Christ of almost all the essential properties of a true body by this fiction of Transubstantiation.

20. And as they feign the Accidents of bread in the Sacrament without the substance of it; so they must needs feign the substance of Christs body without the Accidents of it.

21. Many do teach the presence of Christs body, affirming that one and the same body of Christ undivided does exist upon innumerable Altars, and every where whole.

22. That the body of Christ being in many places at once, and yet not in the space between, is not discontinued or divided from it self in respect of its proper substance or quantity, but only is divided from it self in respect of place.

23. That one and the same body of Christ being in heaven and on earth, yea in innumerable places on earth at once is indeed visible and palpable in heaven, but on earth invisible, and beyond all our senses: There it is limited and circumscribed; here tis unlimited, there it has its Dimensions, here tis free from all dimensions.

24. Moreover they teach an Oral and Capernaitional Manducation of the flesh of Christ, for they say the body of Christ in the Eucharist is really and sensually touched, broken, and eaten.

25. Yea that wicked men receiving the Sacrament of the Altar, do chew the body of

Christ, and break it with their Teeth.

26. And upon the same account, is the very body of Christ devoured by Mice and Doggs, if they chance to eat the host.

27. By reason of this Mystery of Transubstantiation, they call the Sacrament or consecrated host, their *Lord and God*.

28. That the Mass Priest when he makes the Sacrament, or (as they themselves speak) the Body of Christ, he is the Maker of his Maker.

29. The Priest does adore the consecrated Host, and does offer it to others by lifting it up to be adored.

30. And for the same end they keep it and carry it in solemn Procession, that it may be publicly adored.

31. That the Eucharist when it is carryed to the sick is to be adored by all those that meet it, those that do adore it are to have indulgences, those that don't adore it are to be counted Hereticks, and are to be persecuted with fire and sword.

32. By this Bread-worship they commit great idolatry, whilst that they adore a peice of Bread, with the worship of *Latria*, which is onely due to God.

33. In honor of this Breaden-God they celebrate the feast of the body of Christ.

34. Although they confess Christ did administer this venerable Sacrament with both Elements of Bread and Wine, and though they acknowledge this Sacrament was received of the faithful in the Primitive Church with both Elements: Yet they determine that it is to be communicated to the Laity in one kind or Element onely, and forbid the Priests
giv.

ing it to the people in both kinds, upon pain of ex-communication.

35. They teach that whole Christ is in either of the Elements, and that the whole Nature of the Sacrament is to be found in one of them, neither is any more profit reaped from communion in both kinds then in one.

36. Nay that he gets more who communicates in one, in obedience to the Church, then he that communicates in both without that huge fruit of obedience.

37. But this taking away of the Cup from the people may seem a small matter; for it is done but once every year, at which time the Sacrament is given to the people: For in all the rest of the Masses which are continual and daily, they deprive both the people and the Clergy that do not consecrate it of both kinds. For in private Masses it is held forth to be seen by the people and Clergy, and to be adored, not to be received but onely by the Priest that makes it.

38. They urge a mixture of Water with the Wine in the Cup as most necessary.

38. *This the anti-ent Church used, and I should not refuse it either way.*

39. And they assert that the Body of the Lord cannot be rightly taken, but of those that fast.

40. They have converted the Sacrament of the Eucharist by which God communicates Christ to us, into a real Sacrifice in which they do offer up Christ to God.

41. Also the Table into an Altar and the administrator of the Sacrament into a Priest after the order of *Melchizedek*.

42. They

42. They say this new Sacrificing is required, that Christs Body may begin to be an oblation.

43. That Christ in the last Supper did offer his body and blood in both kinds of Bread and Wine, to God the Father as an oblation.

44. That Christ did once offer up himself for us upon the Cross, in the Mass often by the hands of the Priests.

45. That tis one and the same sacrifice which is done in the Mass, and which is offered on the Cross, one-ly they differ in the manner of oblation being without blood.

46. Every Mass Priest offering Christ to God the Father, prays God to accept that Sacrifice, and to command that it may be carried by the hands of an Angel unto the high Altar of God.

47. And therefore they make the Priest Mediator between God and Christ.

48. The Priest in offering that Sacrifice to God for thers, is a Mediator between God and the men for whom he celebrates the Mass.

49. That Christ, when he said in the Supper, *Do this*, commanded the Apostles and their Successors, that they should Sacrifice him and offer him up to God the Father.

50. That by the same words Christ did appoint his Apostles to be Priests.

51. That one never to be repeated offering of Christ, by which he hath consecrated those that are sanctified for ever, They do offer thousands almost infinite times.

52. Neither do they do it onely at divers times and in divers places, but in the same Temple they celebrate divers Masses at divers Altars.

53. They also celebrate Masses (i.e. they offer Christ himself to God) for the honor of the Saints, to obtain their intercession with God.

54. That the sacrifice of the Mass, which they confess is without Blood, is truly propitiatory for the living and for the dead.

55. That the same sacrifice is impetratory not onely of Spiritual but Temporal blessings: hence they are wont to celebrate Mass, i.e. offer Christ to God, for the obtaining of health, for defence, for a prosperous journey, for victory in war, and all other such Temporal benefits; yea for Horses and Hogs, &c.

56. By the Mass, which being hired they are wont to celebrate for others: They say, they can apply to them the vertue of Christs death to take away their sins, and to obtain all manner of benefits.

57. By Masses are souls delivered out of Purgatory.

58. To conclude, They have most filthily polluted the Sacrament of the Eucharist with a multitude of foolish Ceremonies, which were too long to rehearse; And yet in the observation of them they place the worship of God, and merit, and urge them as most necessary, and not to be omitted without mortal sin.

42. They say this new Sacrificing is required, that Christs Body may begin to be an oblation.

43. That Christ in the last Supper did offer his body and blood in both kinds of Bread and Wine, to God the Father as an oblation.

44. That Christ did once offer up himself for us upon the Cross, in the Mass often by the hands of the Priests.

45. That tis one and the same sacrifice which is done in the Mass, and which is offered on the Cross, onely they differ in the manner of oblation being without blood.

46. Every Mass Priest offering Christ to God the Father, prays God to accept that Sacrifice, and to command that it may be carried by the hands of an Angel unto the high Altar of God.

47. And therefore they make the Priest Mediator between God and Christ.

48. The Priest in offering that Sacrifice to God for thers, is a Mediator between God and the men for whom he celebrates the Mass.

49. That Christ, when he said in the Supper, *Do this*, commanded the Apostles and their Successors, that they should Sacrifice him and offer him up to God the Father.

50. That by the same words Christ did appoint his Apostles to be Priests.

51. That one never to be repeated offering of Christ, by which he hath consecrated those that are sanctified for ever, They do offer thousands almost infinite times.

52. Neither do they do it onely at divers times and in divers places, but in the same Temple they celebrate divers Masses at divers Altars.

53. They also celebrate Masses (i.e. they offer Christ himself to God) for the honor of the Saints, to obtain their intercession with God.

54. That the sacrifice of the Mass, which they confess is without Blood, is truly propitiatory for the living and for the dead.

55. That the same sacrifice is impetratory not onely of Spiritual but Temporal blessings: hence they are wont to celebrate Mass, i.e. offer Christ to God, for the obtaining of health, for defence, for a prosperous journey, for victory in war, and all other such Temporal benefits; yea for Horses and Hogs, &c.

56. By the Mass, which being hired they are wont to celebrate for others: They say, they can apply to them the vertue of Christs death to take away their sins, and to obtain all manner of benefits.

57. By Masses are souls delivered out of Purgatory.

58. To conclude, They have most filthily polluted the Sacrament of the Eucharist with a multitude of foolish Ceremonies, which were too long to rehearse; And yet in the observation of them they place the worship of God, and merit, and urge them as most necessary, and not to be omitted without mortal sin.

§ 9. Of their Sacrament of Penance.

1. The word (Sacrament) is not fit matter for much contention.

2. There is some difference in the terminus a quo and ad quem as the Law differeth: but not such as to make one a Sacrament and the other none.

Publike profession of Repentance for open scandalous sins, is a needful duty, sinfully neglected by us, as it is brought to a Sacrament and ceremony with them.

3. This is a certain truth: but that freewill is enabled and moved by Gods grace.

4. Many of them by merit mean but that ex pacto, it is the qualification of these to whom God hath promised Salvation.

1. That Repentance [Penance] is a Sacrament properly so called.

2. That Repentance, in the New Testament is another thing from that which was in the old, and also that in the new Testament which is after Baptisme is another thing from that which is before: For that Repentance which is in the Old Testament, or before Baptism, is not a Sacrament. That saying of Luther is heresie, A new Life is the best Penance.

3. They say contrition is an Act of the Will, done by the power of Freewill, or a sorrow voluntarily assumed.

4. That contrition does deserve forgiveness of sins.

5. That its necessary to justification that sins all and every one (as far as may be) be confessed to the Priest as to a judge.

5, 6, 7, &c. *In flying from their invented way of Confession, we have lamentably wronged the souls of men, by refusing so*

much as Christ hath made our duty and necessary, and the ancient Churches used, and we must use before it will be well with us.

6. That this confession is meritorious of remission of the fault, the lessening of the punishment, the opening of Paradise, and of confidence of salvation.

7. Without Sacramental (which they call Auricular) Confession or the vow of it, sins cannot be forgiven.

8. That sin which was declared under the Seal of Confession is by no means to be disclosed (though it were the Crime of Treason or Rebellion).

9. By the doctrine of satisfaction, they do sacrilegiously, and blasphemously derogate from the satisfaction of Christ.

9, 10. *Some of them by satisfying God, mean no more then the answering of his will, concerning so much of duty or suffering as he*

hath laid upon us. But others worse.

10. They teach indeed the satisfaction of Christ to be full for all, both in respect of the fault and also the punishment; but by way of sufficiency; not by way of efficiency; but satisfaction by way of sufficiency onely deserves not the name of satisfaction.

11. They say the fault being remitted, there remains

11. *The everlasting punishment being*

remitted, the temporal punishment of God by the Magistrate, or by fatherly castigation may remain. And part of it doth remain on us all. For he chasteneth whom he loveth.

12. That satisfaction is required for the compensation of the wrong done to God, and the satisfying of divine justice.

13. That a justified man may truly and properly make satisfaction, not onely to the Church, but even to God himself, namely for the guilt of punishment; which remains to be expiated after the fault is remitted.

14. That it is unbecoming Divine Clemency to remit sin without our own satisfaction.

Three ways we are said to satisfy the Lord.

15. *As satisfying God, signifieth but a sincere doing our duty, we may be said to satisfy him: But to make him reparation for the wrong we have done him, or satisfy his Law by perfect obedience, or his Vindictive Justice by our sufferings here, is impossible.*

16. Secondly, By voluntary undertaking laborious works.

17. Thirdly, By undergoing the punishment imposed by the discretion of the Priest.

18. *Chastisement is a true and proper species of punishment agreed on.*

18. That all the afflictions of the faithful are to be accounted for true and proper punishments of sin.

19. That

19. That the calamities, which are laid upon the just after conversion, are to be born in some sence to compensate their offence.

20. That it is not sufficient that we repent except we also satisfy God by painful and satisfactory works.

20, 28, &c. *As satisfying God is but pleasing him, all our duties satisfy.*

21. Amongst those painful works, they reckon their Whippings of themselves, and Pilgrimages unto the places of the Saints, &c.

22. Prayer they reckon amongst penal works.

22. *Prayer and a holy life is a delight and great benefit; but*

accidentally may be troublesome so far as we are carnal, and therefore requireth some self-denial.

23. Fasting also and Almes deeds they teach to be satisfactory works.

24. That one man may satisfy for another, but less suffering is required of him that satisfies for another.

24. *One man may do a duty that conduceth to anothers spiritual good, but not by merit.*

25. That the satisfactory and penal works of the Saints may be communicated and applyed to others.

26. That the vertue of Christs blood is applyed to us by the Priests absolution.

26. *The Right use of Absolution applyeth Christs blood declaratively. And is*

too much laid by in most Churches.

27. That by vertue of the Priests absolution, eternal punishment is turned into temporal, which also the Priest imposes according to his discretion.

28. That

28. That the words of absolution are not onely a sign but also a cause of remission of sin, or that they do effect justification: for by the Priests absolution is sin driven away removed *ex opere operato* as a cloud by the wind.

29. That a man cannot be reconciled to God without a Sacramental absolution.

30. That Sacerdotal absolution hath that force of justifying; because many desiring reconciliation and believing in Christ are damned, onely because they died before they could be absolved by a Priest: or. (as they otherwise express their meaning) do perish for that onely they could not have a reconciling Priest.

31. To Papal absolution we refer the Jubilees and their sale of indulgences.

32. Also in the year of Jubilee (which they have reduced from the hundredth to the fiftieth, and thence to the twenty fifth) they promise full remission of all sins to those that visit the Temples of *Peter and Paul*, and the *Lateran Church*.

33. They assert that there is a treasure of overflowing satisfactions in the Church not onely of Christ, but also of the Saints which the Pope by indulgences can apply both to the living and dead, by which they are delivered from the guilt of punishment before God.

34. That souls are freed from Purgatory by indulgences.

35. They confess there is no need to adde the satisfaction of the Saints to the satisfaction of Christ (which they cannot deny to be infinite and alwayes overflowing) yet they (to whom gain is godliness) think meet to add them.

36. Neither do they bestow indulgences for a few dayes or years, but for many thousands of years : from whence it is manifest they do but make a jest of the Article of the day of judgement which according to their own opinion will put an end to Purgatory, and all temporal punishments.

37. To conclude in all their Sacramental penance they make no mention of faith at all, and of Christ scarce any.

38. For Repentance (Penance) which they will have to be a plank after shipwrack they say consists (on the penitents part) in contrition ; auricular confession, and satisfaction ; on the Priests part in Sacramental absolution, as the act of a Judge, whose words are, I do absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost.

39. That that is a pious prayer which some are wont to use in Monasteries after absolution given for sin : let the merit of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*, and of all Saints, the Merit of Order, and the burthen of Religion, the humility of Confession, the contrition of heart, the good works which thou hast done, and wilt do for the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, beseech thee for remission of sin, and increase of merit and grace, and for the reward of Eternal Life. Amen.

§ 10. Of *extream Unction*.

1. **T**hat the *extream Unction* is truly and properly a Sacrament of the New Testament, and indeed an ordinary one.

2. That this Sacrament doth confer grace, making us acceptable *ex opere operato* : doth restore health to the sick, and blot out sins if any remaine.

3. That by this Unction (which they apply to the eyes, to the ears, to the mouth, to the loynes, and to the hands) God doth grant to the sick whatsoever is wanting by that fault of the senses.

4. That by this Sacrament a man may sometimes be saved, who should otherwise plainly be damned.

1. That Ordination is truly and properly a Sacrament of the new Law, conferring to the Ordained Grace making him acceptable *ex opere operato*.

2. There are seven, or rather eight Sacraments of Order, all which are truly, or properly called Sacraments, *viz.* The Order of Porters, of Readers, of Exorcists, of Servitors of Sub-Deacons, of Deacons and Presbyters, and Bishops.

3. In every one of is given to the Ordained, the seven fold Grace of the Spirit, yea Grace making them acceptable, and that *ex opere operato*.

4. That anointing is required in Ordination.

Of Marriage.

1. That Matrimony, though it were instituted in Paradise, is truly and properly a Sacrament of the new Law.

2. And therefore does confer grace upon the married, making them acceptable, *ex opere operato*.

3. That the Church has power to constitute impediments that shall hinder marriage.

4. That the Church has power to dispense with the degrees of Consanguinity forbidden of God, and to make more degrees which shall not onely hinder marriage, but break it.

5. That marriage confirmed, not consummated, is also dissolved, in respect of the Bond, by the entrance of one of the parties into a vow without the consent of the other.

6. That the solemn Vow of Chastity, and holy Orders, are an impediment both hindring marriage to be made, and breaking it being made.

7. Also difference of Religion does not onely hinder marriage to be made, but also break it being made.

8. That marriage contracted between Infidels, when either is converted to the faith, is broken, *viz.* because that marriage was not a Sacrament.

9. That the Church of Rome did rightly prohibit marriage of old to the seventh, but afterwards to the fourth degree of Consanguinity, according to the Canonical rule of reckoning (but the fourth degree of Canonical reckoning is the seventh and eighth in the Civil Law.)

10. The Spiritual kindred (which riseth forth from Baptism and Confirmation) may hinder marriage to be made, and break it being made.

§ 11. *Of the Effects of Grace.*

NOW follow the Effects of Grace or the degrees of Salvation, such are vocation, justification, &c.

1. *Gods love or favour is our Radicall Grace, from which flow both Relative effects in pardon, justification, adoption, and Physical in our Renovation: all which are called also Grace.*

1. Where first the Papists do egregiously erre in expounding the word [grace] for when the holy Spirit, speaking of these effects of Divine grace, saith we are justified by grace, and saved by grace, &c. By grace they understand not the free favour of God in Christ, but

the gift of grace inherent in us: as if the Scripture did not say we are called, justified, and saved by the same grace we are elected and redeemed by.

2. And then when they divide the grace of God into eternal grace, which they call the everlasting love of God: and temporary such as the benefit of vocation and justification are: again they divide this temporary grace into grace freely given, and grace making acceptable, both which they will have to be a quality inherent in us, as if either all grace which they call temporary, did inhere in us, or that which doth inhere in us were not all freely given.

3. Grace making us acceptable they will not have to be the grace of God, by which he loves us and makes us acceptable to him, according to that, *wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved*: but to be grace by way of habit remaining in us, by which we love God, therefore they call charity a grace making us acceptable, as if by reason of its force and merit men were saved of God.

4. Moreover when they divide grace into sufficient and efficacious grace they say sufficient grace is given to all and every man even without the Church, by which they have a power to will, and they can if they will, believe, and by believing be saved.

But the Papists, especially the Dominicans affirm not, sufficient grace to believe to be given to those that hear not the Gospel: but onely sufficient grace to that which tendeth to this further grace.

5. If any want sufficient grace to avoid sin, they do not truly sin, neither are they guilty of sin before God.

6 That in the first act of conversion, the will is not passive.

3. To deny either Relative or Inherent Grace, is to deny that without which there is no salvation. The necessity of Pardon at least, many of them confess.

4. No doubt but all have so much grace that they may believe and be saved, if they will (sincerely). Because though velle credere be not credere, as Doctor Twiss answers it, yet credere est voluntatis, as Austin an-

6. The will is first passive in receiving the Divine influx, but active in the eliciting its own a.

7. *The will hath natural Power or faculty to resist or yield, which will not be brought in to act for yielding, because it wanteth moral power, that is, it is disinclined. But to resist it hath too much moral Power, which is impotency, yet such as grace can heal.*

7. That it is in the power of mans free will to resist or yeild to efficacious grace.

§ 12. Of Justification.

But now the doctrine of Justification they utterly overthrow.

1. *Perverting the term, they cause a strife about a word.*

1. For first they confound justification which is an act of God without us, as Redemption, Reconciliation, Adoption, with Sanctification and Inherent Righteousness: and so confound not onely the Gospel with the Law, but quite take away Justification it self, the chief benefit we have by Christ in this life.

2. *Some of them make merit of congruity (which they say, precedeth justification) to be properly no merit. And some of them deny that there is any proper merit of condignity at all: But others are gross in this*

3. *The term Remission also they abuse, meaning by it, the*

2. They teach men to lay the cause of justification and the merit of salvation in themselves.

3. They will have remission of sin to be a blotting of them out, by which not only the

the guilt but also the irregularity it self is abolished.

givness they take in with it. And so they make many verbal controversies.

4. As in warming, the cold is expelled by the coming of the heat: so in justification sin is abolished by the infusion of righteousness.

per Scripture. And also they so much hide the very being of pardon by perverting the words that signifie it, that its hard to find in some of them, whether they confess any such thing as pardon.

5. Neither will they understand justification in the Scripture, as a Law-term to be opposed to condemnation, and Sanctification to pollution.

6. The Scripture teaches sanctification to be an action of God: they make the second justification, as they call it, not Gods action but their own.

change of our qualities, or putting away sin it self, though for- And so they make many

4. This is true of Sanctification, which is the thing they mean by justification: But by this abuse of the terms, they misinter-

pret Scripture. And also they so much hide the very being of pardon by perverting the words that signifie it, that its hard to find in some of them, whether they confess any such thing as pardon.

6. As to the Act, they make it their own by merited grace: but the habits and the grace assisting, they say is of God, and the act, say most.

7. Whereas the Scripture teacheth that we are justified by the grace of God intimating the inward moving cause of justification, which is the free favor of God in Christ: the Papists understand grace, or rather graces inherent in us: which yet in the Question of justification (wherein the holy

7. This is their verbal error: no doubt that which they mean by justification, that is, Sanctification, consisteth in Inherent grace.

Ghost opposes works to grace) are not more opposed to works than their first justification is to the second.

8. *This they say of justification taken for sanctification, but not as taken for Pardon. But they are led still to misinterpret Scriptures by misunderstanding the word.*

not revealed in the Law, and therefore not inherent, but which is revealed in the Gospel without the Law. They understand a righteousness infused by God and inherent in us.

9. *Still they mean sanctification, when they speak of justification. But they confess that Christs sufferings and obedience are the meritorious cause of our Pardon and Renovation, both which they use to comprize in the word Justification.*

the infusion of habitual righteousness, viz. in the first justification, partly by our own performance of actual righteousness or good works in the second justification.

8. When the Scripture teacheth that we are justified by the righteousness of God, and the blood of God i. e. of Christ who is God (for by his obedience and blood, we are justified, and he is our righteousness) I say by a righteousness which is

9. When the Scripture teaches that we are made the righteousness of God in Christ, as he is made sin for us, and so that the obedience of Christ is communicated to us for justification, as the disobedience of Adam for condemnation namely by imputation; But they say we are justified not by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but partly by

10. For they contend for a double justification; the first which consists in the infused habit of charity, the other in meritorious works.

there is such a thing as that which they mean by a second justification, if they leave out merit: for there is actual obedience and increase of grace.

Whenas the Scripture teacheth that we are justified by faith without works i. e. not by inherent righteousness, but by the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, and therefore that we are not justified by faith as it is a part of inherent righteousness, for so with other graces it sanctifies us) nor by any other faith, then that which apprehends the righteousness of Christ, or by any other grace (because there is no other beside faith that apprehends Christs righteousness) and therefore by faith alone.

11. The Papists on the contrary teach faith to justify as it is a part of inherent righteousness.

12. And not so much to justify, as to dispose us for justification, by obtain-

16. They may as well talk of a third and fourth justification, for sanctification hath more degrees then two. But doubtlesse

The Scripture saith we are justified by believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, that is, By assenting to his Gospel, and accepting him entirely as Christ, that is, by becoming true Christians, or Christs Disciples. For a believer and a Disciple in the Gospel usually signifie the same thing.

11. *It doth sanctifie as a part of inherent righteousness: and it is the receptive condition of Pardon.*

12. *I would they said no more but that it disposeth to it, for*
ing

then they would not say it deserveth it. ing remission, and deserving justification.

13. For, say they, faith and Repentance do justify as dispositions, and meritorious causes *ex congruo*.

14. Still they mean Sanctifying.

15. An absurd speech: but they add that its not the form of faith as faith, but of faith and all other graces, as saving or as a new Life. And we agree that faith is principally in the will: and the Velle is by the Schoolmen called the Diligere.

16. Its unreasonable for them to call that justifying faith, which wants that which they take to be the form of it.

17. And therefore that a man having true faith may be damned.

18. They say it must be explicate in some points, which we call essential, and that we must believe in Christ as satisfying justice and meriting for us pardon and sanctification.

19. Thats but some of them.

14. But that charity is properly the justifying grace.

15. And the form of justifying faith.

16. And yet that true justifying faith may be separated from charity.

18. Neither do they acknowledge any special faith which apprehends the righteousness of Christ, but they say that is sufficient, which consists in a general consent, without all assiance (yea even without knowledge) which they call implicate faith.

19. For they say faith is better defined by ignorance then knowledge.

20. Nei-

20. Neither can they in-
dure by any means that we
say faith only justifies.

20. *They manage
this controversie in the
dark, not agreeing
with us in the sence of
the termes of the Question.*

21. When as the Scrip-
ture plainly excludes works
as causes from the act of
justification, though it re-

21. *Neither faith
nor works are proper
causes.*

quire them in the subject or person justified, as ne-
cessary fruits of justifying faith, by which believers
are justified that is declared to be just; but they
assert that we are not justified before God by faith
onely but also by works as the causes of justifica-
tion.

22. And in this matter they make *James* plainly
to contradict *Paul*.

23. And they invert the disputation of *Paul*, as
if the Question he disputes were, whether faith justi-
fies without works, but whether works justify with-
out faith.

24. That men are justified by the observation of
Gods, and the Churches commands.

25. That men deserve remission of mortal sins by
repentance, Almes deeds, forgiving injuries, conver-
ting an offending Brother, and other duties of piety
and charity by which we do not deny but our belief
of the pardon of sin is confirmed.

26. And that venial sins are purged away by the
repetition of the Lords prayer, by striking the
breast, by sprinkling of Holy Water, and the Bishops
blessing &c.

27. That a wicked man may deserve justifying
grace, *ex congruo*, and that this merit of con-
gruity

gruity is when the sinner doth his utmost.

28. So did the Ancients, even Augustine himself, and 100 many Protestants.

29. This also was too common with the Ancients, and is now with the said Protestants.

30. Some of them yield a certainty of present Remission and justification, and moral conjectural certainty of Salvation.

31. No man can be certain of his justification without a special revelation.

32. That no man in this world ought to seek an infallible certainty of his salvation or justification.

33. That doubting of the pardon of sin is not an infirmity but a vertue.

34. To be certain of it is a great mercy: but to believe that it is a thing written in Scripture, that I am pardoned, is not a duty: for it is not there.

35. About this they differ: See Magro in sent. that faith hath certaine evidence, which Ariminensis and others confute, saying it hath evidence of credibility, but not of certainty.

28. They deny justification be to proper to the Elect.

29. That no man in this life ought certainly to determine that he is of the number of the elect.

30. That every one must doubt of the remission of their sins.

34. For any one certainly to believe that his sins are forgiven him through Christ, is abominable presumption.

35. That faith which the Apostle calls the substance, & evidence, and full assurance, they will have to be doubtful and uncertain.

36. Also hope, which yet the Apostle commends as an Anchor sure and stedfast, and that maketh not him, that hopes, ashamed.

§ 13. *Of Sanctification and good Works.*

1. **T**hat concupiscence in the regenerate is no sin.

1. The meer appetite is no sin, but the corruption and rebellion of it is.

2. That the regenerate or baptized may perfectly fulfill the Law.

2. I would we could see one of them do it once. Its a shameful arguing for perfection

by bare words, when none of them will give us a proof of it by their own example.

3. That the works of the righteous are simply and absolutely righteous.

3. They that believe this, know not themselves.

4. That sins are expiated by good works according to the proverb, forsooth, he that steals much and gives a little, shall escape.

5. That good Works do concur by way of efficiency to salvation, or are necessary not onely for their presence, but for their efficiency.

5. Piscator and other of ours maintain this. Though a meritorious efficiency we all deny.

6. And that good works are not onely such as are commanded by God: but such as are voluntarily undertaken by men with a good intention.

7. That the good works of the righteous not onely justifi-

7. The Scotists and many more of them defend

*ny this: but so do not
Bellarmine and many
others.*

8. Waldensis and
others of them deny all
merit, but thats not
common, see instances
in my Confession.

good works and their
life.

9. To the merit of condignity there is required
an equality of proportion in the merit to the re-
ward.

10. To the good works of the righteous eternal
happinefs is as well due as eternal sufferings to the
fins of the wicked.

11. That in every Christian work, proceeding
from grace the merit of Christs blood is applyed.

12. That Christ by his death merited that our
works might be satisfactory for sins, and meritorious
of eternal life, or thus, Christ merited that by our
own merits we might attain salvation.

13. That every act of charity, or every good work
proceeding from Charity, doth absolutely deserve
eternal life.

14. That good works are meritorious of three
things, viz. of remitting the punishment, of increase
of grace, and of eternal Life.

15. That a righteous man may deserve for himself
an increase of righteousness by way of condignity.

fic, but also by way of con-
dignity deserve eternal life,
both for the Covenants sake
and also the works them-
selves.

8. And that that is merit
of condignity by which a
man indued with grace and
the holy Spirit after he hath
deserved the habit of love
by former merit doth by his
condignity deserve eternal

16. Neither do they think they must trust to their own, but to other mens merits also.

17. That one believer may merit grace for another by way of congruity.

1. That a justified and sanctified man may fall from the grace of God both totally and finally, and perish for ever.

2. That the grace of justification received, is lost by every mortal sin.

3. The grace of justification being lost by sin, yet faith is not lost.

4. That faith is lost by every act of unbelief.

14. Of good works particularly, of fasting.

1. **O**F Fasting I have spoken already, that the Papists place Fasting in the choice of meats.

2. That their fasts are hypocritical.

3. And superstitious.

4. That fasting even as it is observed by them (which indeed is the meer mockery of a true fast) is a work satisfactory for sin, and meritorious of eternal life, they impiously and blasphemously teach.

5. Their prayers they pour out not onely to God but to Angels and Saints.

6. That we may lawfully and meritoriously beseech and pray the Saints both to intercede for us with God, and to give assistance to us.

7. They

7. They teach men to confess their sins to the Saints that are dead.

8. That God reveals our prayers to the Saints which we put up to them, and yet that we must go to them as Mediators betwixt God and us.

9. They call upon God represented under some figure or shape.

10. They mutter their prayers before images saying, sometimes the Lords prayer before a picture of the Virgin *Mary*, or of some other Saint, and *Ave Marias* before a crucifix.

11. They pray not onely in the name of Christ, but also they believe they shall be heard for the prayers and intercession of the Saints.

12. Neither do they pray for the living onely, but also for the dead.

13. That a general intention of worshipping God is sufficient when they pray, though they neither understand nor mark what they say.

14. They teach their Disciples to pray in an unknown tongue, and so without faith, without understanding, without feeling like Parrots.

15. They teach them to number their prayers upon certain Beads, and to pray God, as it were a task of numbred prayers.

16. In which also they teach them mightily to tautologize, and to hope they shall be heard for their much speaking.

17. They not onely reckon the Salutation of the blessed Virgin, and the Apostles Creed amongst their prayers, but also teach them to say a hundred and fifty *Ave Marias*, and after every ten *Ave Marias*, one *Pater Noster*, and after fifty, one Creed.

18. And

18. And that prayer (even such as they are wont to bable before pictures in an unknown tongue, either for the dead or to the dead, without faith, without understanding, without feeling) is a satisfactory work for sin, and meritorious of eternal Life.

19. Also Almes-deeds to be meritorious and satisfactory.

§ 15. Of Glorification.

1. **A**S to the state of Believers after this life, they teach, that Heaven was shut, till Christs passion.

2. That the thief converted on the Cross, was the first of all believers that entred into the heavenly Paradise.

3. They make three receptacles of Souls after death, besides heaven and the place of the damned, viz. *limbus patrum*, *limbus infantum*, and Purgatory, to which they also adde a certain kind of flourishing, light, sweet, and pleasant Meadow, in which they place certain souls who suffer nothing, but remaine there for a while, because they are not yet fit for the beatifical vision.

4. That the souls of the faithful before Christs resurrection were in a subterraneous pit; which they call *limbus Patrum*.

5. That the fathers dead before Christs ascension were not happy.

6. All little ones dying before Baptism, they thrust into *limbus infantum*, to be

6. Some of them say they are punished also with the pain of punished

senses. See Concious punished with eternal punishment of loss, not of sence. Tractat. in the end of Janfenii Augustin.

7. The faithful which depart, either with venial sins upon them, or with the guilt of punishment (the sin being before remitted) they cast into Purgatory, to be burnt there with corporeal fire, till they be fully purged.

8. That the suffrages of the Church such as the sacrifice of the Mass and prayer, penal and satisfactory works, as Almes-Deeds, Fasting, Pilgrimages, and the like, do profit the dead in Purgatory: and especially indulgences by which the satisfactory works of others are applied to them.

9. For the Pope can communicate the prayers and good works of believers to them; whence it follows, as *Albertus* said, the condition of the rich in this case is better then the poor, because he hath wherewithal to get suffrages for him.

10. That the Saints in Heaven do not onely pray for the living on earth in particular, but also for the dead in Purgatory.

11. That the Saints are our mediators and advocates with God, understanding our prayers and necessities, and therefore to be called upon to pray for us.

12. That the Saints after death do obtain whatsoever they desire of God, because they deserved it in this life.

13. That their merits do profit us for salvation.

14. That the Saints are helpers and coworkers of our salvation.

15. That the faithful living, are ruled and governed

verned by the Spirits of blessed men.

16. That the Saints are to be Canonized by the Pope, and being Canonized to be worshiped.

16. Bellarmine *confesseth, that in such cases of fact and particular judgement thereon the Pope may erre : And so no Papists living can be certain, but that they pray to the damned souls in hell, whom the Pope mistakingly canonized.*

17. Therefore we must fly to the Saints in our misery.

§ 16. Of the Church.

1. **T**Hat the holy Catholike Church that we believe, is visible.

1, 2. *Yet we confess a Catholike visible continued Church.*

2. And alwayes is visible.

3. That it depends not on Gods election, nor on true faith and Charity, that one belongs to this Church. But even wicked and reprobate men are members of the Catholike Church.

3. *Some of our own say as much of late; but they mean it of the visible Church onely.*

4. That the Catholike Church is no other than the Roman, or that which the Roman Pope is over.

4. *This is the heart of Popery.*

5. That the Catholike Church, and the Pope of Rome are the same terms.

6. Neither are there any Catholicks, but those of the Romish Church.

7. That he is a Catholike who believes all that the *Roman* Church delivers, whether it be written in the Bible or not.

8. That there is no salvation out of the Roman Church.

9. That the notes of universality, antiquity, unity, and succession in the Apostles doctrine do agree unto it.

10. That the sincere preaching of the Gospel, and lawful administration of the Sacraments, are not a certain note of the Church.

11. To acknowledge the *Roman* Pope, and to be under him as the Vicar of Christ, the onely Pastor, the head of the whole Church, is a note of the true Church.

12. That the particular *Roman* Church is the Mother, Mistris, and Lady of all Churches : yea the Mother of Faith.

13. That the *Roman* Church did obtain the primacy from our Lord and Saviour himself.

14. That the *Roman* Church hath power of judging all, neither is it lawful for any to judge her judgment.

15. That the *Roman* Church hath authority to deliver doctrines of faith, without or beside the Scriptures.

16. That the *Roman* Church cannot erre in faith, much less fail.

17. That the *Roman* Church cannot erre, in interpreting Scripture.

§. 17.

Of the *Roman Church* } The Head, viz.
 } The Pope.
 } The Members.

1. **T**hat the *Roman Pope* is the head, foundation, husband, Monarch of the whole universal Church, the universal Bishop, or the Bishop of the whole world.

1: Hence Popery, and Papists are denominated.

2. That the *Roman Pope* is the rock upon whom the Church is built.

3. The names which are given to Christ in the Scriptures, from whence it appears he is above the Church, all of them are given to the Pope. *Unto this Antichristian throne he ascends by a gradation of most impudent lies, such as these.*

4. That the universal Church cannot consist, unless there be one in it, as a visible head with chief power.

5. Therefore the external regiment of the universal Church is Monarchical.

6. That the Monarchy of the Church was instituted in *Peter*.

7. That *Peter* in proper speech, was Bishop of *Rome*, and remained Bishop there untill death.

8. That the Pope succeeded *Peter* in the Ecclesiastical Monarchy.

9. Neither do they give the Monarchy of Ecclesiastical power, but of temporal also to the Pope.

10. Neither do they make the Pope Christs General Vicar on earth, but Gods also.

11. They give a certain omnipotency to him.

12. They give him power of deposing Kings and Emperors, and absolving their subjects from the oath of fidelity.

13. Moreover, without shame they defend, that the Pope teaching from his chair cannot erre.

14. That his words when he teacheth from his chair, are in a sort the word of God.

15. That the Pope cannot erre, even in those things which belong to good manners, or in the commands of morality, as well as in matters of Faith.

16. We must piously believe, that as the Pope cannot erre as Pope: so as a private person he cannot be a heretick.

17. *Much of these by the French is ascribed to a General Council, and denied to the Pope: so well are they agreed in their fundamentals.*

17. That the chief authority of interpreting Scripture is in him.

18. That the Pope is the chief judge in controversies of Religion.

19. We must appeal from all Churches to him.

20. They give him authority to dispense with humane and Divine Laws.

21. They give him power of absolving men not onely from sin, but from punishments, censures, laws, vows, and oaths.

22. Also of delivering men from Purgatory.

23. Of

23. Of Canonizing Saints, and giving them honors, that they may be prayed to in the Publike Prayers of the Church, that Churches and Altars may be built for their honor, that Masses and Canonical hours be offered publicly for their honor, and feast-dayes be celebrated, That their Pictures be drawn with a certain splendor, that their Reliques be put into precious boxes, and publicly honored.

24. We must believe that the Pope (*who sometime puts Murderers, Traitors, King-killers, and other Capital offenders into the Calendar of Saints and Martyrs*) never errs in the Canonizing of Saints.

§ 18.

The Members of the Church } Congregated in
are considered, either as } Councils, or
Severally.

1. **T**He office of convocating General Councils, properly belongs to the Pope.

2. That in no case a true and perfect Council can be called, without the Popes authority, no not if it be necessary for the Church, and yet the Pope will not, or cannot call one, nor if the Pope be a heretick. And therefore that a Council held without the Popes Authority is an unlawful meeting or Conventicle, not a Council.

3. That 'tis the proper office of the Pope, that by himself or his Legates, he be president of the universal Council, and as the supreme judge do moderate all.

4. That the decree of a General Council made without the consent of the Pope, or his Legate, is unlawful.

5. *The French agree not to these.*

5. That the Power of confirming or rejecting General Councils is in the Pope of Rome, neither are the Councils authentical, unless they be confirmed by the Pope.

6. That the distinction of lawful and unlawful Councils does depend upon his onely will.

7. That the sentence of a General Council in a matter of faith is the last judgement of the Church, from which it cannot appeal: yet that we may appeal from a General Council to the Pope.

8. That the Pope can neither be judged nor punished by a Council or by any mortals.

9. That the Pope cannot submit himself to the co-active judgement of Councils.

10. That the Pope is absolutely over the universal Church, and above a General Council, so that he can acknowledge no judgement above him.

11. We must believe with Catholike faith, that General Councils confirmed by the Pope cannot erre neither in faith nor manners.

12. That particular Councils approved by the Pope cannot erre.

13. That the power of the Pope and Council together, is not greater then the Popes alone. *Thyrecrem. l. 3. c. 41.*

§ 19. *Of the Members by themselves.*

1. **T**hat to make a member of the Catholike Church, there is not required grace, or any internal virtue, but a profession of faith is sufficient.

1. *Of the visible Church we say the same.*

The Members of the Church considered severally, are,
The Clergy.
The Laity.

2. That Clergy men are not held under civil Laws, by any coactive, but onely directive bond.

3. That Clergy men breaking the Civil Law, cannot yet be punished by any civil Judge, nor be brought before the Tribunal of Secular Magistrates.

4. That the goods of the Clergy, both Ecclesiastical and Secular, are free from the Tribute and Tax of Secular Princes.

5. That men are to be prepared for receiving Orders, by the first shaving.

6. By how much the higher degree of Order any one is in, by so much the larger shaving is he to be crowned with.

7. That single life is alwayes joyned to holy Orders, by Divine right.

The Popish Clergy are either	{ Seculars and those either Regulars	{ Of the lowest Order. Of the higher Order. which they call Priests and are both	{ The less as Presbyters. The greater as Bishops.
------------------------------------	---	--	--

8. That the Clergy men of the highest Order are Priests, properly so called, which they say are instituted to offer an external and real sacrifice.

9. The choice of Bishops does belong to the Pope by Divine right.

10. *The Spaniards* That all the Bishops receive jurisdiction from the Pope.
hindred the passing of that in the Council of Trent.

11. The *Romane* Church hath Cardinals for sidersmen to the Pope, upon whom the universal Church is turned as upon hinges.

12. These are to be joyned with the Pope in the Government of the universal Church.

13. That those, whether they be Bishops or Presbyters, or Deacons are not only to be preferred before other Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, Patriarchs, but to be equalled even with Kings.

§ 20. *Of Councils and Monastical vows.*

1. **T**hey teach that there are Evangelical Councils distinct from commands, which no man is bound to perform, but they who profess perfection, and would deserve more and greater things than eternal life.

2. That the study of perfection is not of command but Councils.

3. Such

3. Such Councils are those, of not seeking revenge, of loving our adversaries, of not swearing, &c.

4. Not to obey a Council is no sin.

5. That some perfection is necessary to salvation, and that consists in the full observation of the commands.

5. 6. *Have the Quakers learn't this distinction of perfection, yet?*

6. That some other perfection is greater and is necessary, not simply for salvation, but for a more excellent degree of glory: and that consists in the observation of Councils.

7. By obedience to Councils, men do supererogate.

8. That vowed Virginitie and single life, are most acceptable worship to God.

9. Yea, and the greatest satisfaction for sin, and merit of eternal life.

10. A Monastick life is a state of Perfection.

11. All that's done by vow, is a worship of God.

12. Monastical vows do satisfie for sin, and deserve eternal life.

13. Our entrance into Religion, is a second Baptism, or in stead of a new Baptism, by which satisfaction is made for all former sins.

14. That perfection is to be placed in true Monastick vows, as the vow of voluntary poverty, the vow of perpetual chastity, the vow of Monastical obedience.

15. That voluntary poverty is rightly vowed to God.

16. That its lawful; Lawful? yea a meritorious work, a work of perfection and supererogation in Monks to live on begging.

17. It

17. It is lawful, yea meritorious, for the younger men to vow single life for ever.

18. The vow of single life, is to be kept by them who have the gift of continency.

19. There is none, but may alwayes contain, if he will.

20. That 'tis lawful for children to enter into a vow, against their parents consent.

21. They allow of great variety of vows, which have various rules of life, invented by men, beside the holy Scripture. And as if there were greater perfection in those rules, then in the doctrine of the Gospel, and a more compendious way to perfection and salvation: they teach, by the observation of them, eternal life and a more excellent degree of glory is obtained.

22. They give the obedience which is due onely to God, unto the men that live after the Rules of the Franciscan, Dominican order, &c.

23. That the Apostles were the first Christian Monks.

24. To them who are buried in the Cowlis of the Monkes, especially of the *Franciscans* they promise remission of sin in some part.

25. *In all causes materially, they are: but not in all formally, for they are not the supreme in every sort of Government (that is, in Ministerial Directive) but in their own sort, that is coactive.* 25. That Princes are not the supream Governors of their subjects on earth, in all causes spiritual and temporal.

26. They make Princes subject to the people as well as to the Pope.

§. 21. *Of the Law.*

Of Charity, or things to be done, the sum
of which are in the Decalogue.

1. **T**hat regenerate and baptized persons may perfectly fulfill the Law, so far as they are bound to fulfill it in this life.

2. The fulfilling of the Law in this life, is not onely possible but easie.

2. *What need you confess sin, that can fulfill the Law so easily? out of your own mouths are you judged now, that do not that which you think so easie.*

3. That every degree of Grace is sufficient to fulfill the commandments and expel all sins.

4. That we are not bound in this life to love God with all our hearts.

4. *Others of them say the contrary.*

5. And all our souls, and all our strength: Neither are we bound, not to have evil concupiscence.

6. That venial sins, as they call them, do not hinder that perfect obedience which is required in this life.

7. That the regenerate can do more then the Law requires.

8. They teach their Disciples to worship God under a humane shape or figure.

9. That Angels are to be worshiped and called upon.

10. Also

10. Also Saints that are dead, are to be worshiped and called upon.

11. That a more than ordinary worship is due to the blessed Virgin: such as they teach Christs humanity was to be worshiped with; but to the rest of the Saints, ordinary worship.

12. That the members of the Blessed Virgin are to be adored, for so they touch them [I worship and Bless thy feet, with which thou didst tread down the Old Serpents head: I worship and bless thy comely eyes, &c.]

23. That according to the five letters of her name *Maria*, she is the Mediatrix of God and men, the Auxiliatrix or helper of God and men, the repaire of the weak, the illuminater of the blind; the Advocate for all sin.

14. They name her the Queen of heaven, our Lady and Goddess; the Lady of Angels, the fountain of all graces. *Orat. Steph. Patracen. in Concil. Later. Sess. 10. 666. 6. f.*

15. For her honor and worship they have composed, Duties, Letanies, Rosaries, and a Psaltery all full of Idolatry.

16. In the Psaltery of *Mary*, whatsoever almost David has spoken of God and Christ, they blasphemously give to her; as for example,

O Lady in thee have I put my trust, deliver my soul from mine enemies. In *Psal. 7.* And I will praise thee, O Lady with my whole heart, *Psal. 9.* I put my trust in thee O Lady, *Pf. 10.* Save me O Lady, *Psal.*

11. Keep me O Lady, because I have hoped in thee, *Psal. 15.* The heavens declare thy Glory, O Virgin *Mary!* *Psal. 19.* To thee O Lady have I lifted up my soul, *Psal. 25.* Have mercy on me, O Lady, who

art the mother of mercies, and according to the bowels of thy mercy cleanse me from all my sins, *Pf. 51.* And pour out thy Grace upon me. O Lady, Save me by thy name, and free me from all my misdeeds, *Pfal. 54.* Deliver me from mine enemies, O Queen of the world! *Pfal. 59.* Praise waiteth for our Lady in Sion, *Pfal. 65.* Make a joyful noise unto our Lady all ye lands, *Pfal. 66.* Let *Mary* arise and let all her enemies be scattered, *Pfal. 68.* In thee O Lady, do I put my trust, let me never be put to confusion, Deliver me in thy mercy, *Pfal. 71.* Make a joyful noise unto our Lady all ye lands, serve her with gladness, *Pfal. 100.* And so in the rest, all which they say are to be spoken out of a pious affection to the Blessed Virgin.

17. They prefer the Saints to the rule of the world, and the Government of the Church, as if they were the worlds Presidents, and the Churches Rectors. Yea they set them in the same place, as the Heathens of old did their titular Gods and preservers: and assign unto them several Provinces, Offices, and jurisdictions (because it would be a vast burden for every one to look to all.) For, every Region, every Parish, every Fraternity of Artificers have their titular Gods and Patrons. So *P. Jovius* calls them, *Histor. li. 24.* in the end. And there came forth lately a Commentary of *Philip* the 39. Bishop of the Church at *Eisstreet*, of the titular Gods of that Church, *S^t Richard*, *S^t Wumbald*, *S^t Walpurg*. And we may as truly affirm of the Papists what *Gregory de valentia* saies of the Heathens; For that very thing sayes he, we may apprehend them to be idolaters, because they distribute their several Provinces of offices to several creatures, as to Gods, &c.

There are certain Saints for the cure of every disease

ease almost, and for curing of evils : as *Sebastian* and *Rochus* for the plague : *Apollonia* for the toothache : *Antony* for the Wildfire or Gangrene : *Ottilia* for sore eyes : *Quirinus* for Fistula's, *Sigismund* and *Petronella* for a Feaver, *Apollinaris* for the Privities (as *Priapus* of old) *Liberius* for the Stone, and also *Benedict*. *Wolfgangus* cures Convulsions, *Romanus* the possessed, *Valentinus* the Epilepticks (as *Hercules* of old) *Anastatius* such as are mad.

The work of delivering Captives is committed to *Leonard*, of assisting in war to *George* (as of old to *Mars*.) *Nicholas*, and *Christopher* are Patrons to Seamen : the three Kings, viz. of *Cullen* to Travelers : *Margaret* to women in childbirth (as *Juno Lucina* of old.) *Gregory* and *Katharine* to Students (as *Appollo* and *Minerva* of old.) To Merchants *Erasmus*, to Painters *Lucas*, to Smiths *Eylogius*, to Shoo-makers *Crispin*, to Taylers *Gutman*, to Potters *Goasus*, to Weavers *Severinus*, to Carpenters *Joseph*, to horsemen *George*, to Hunters *Enstachius*, to Whores *Afra* and *Maudlin* (as *Venus* and *Flora* of old.)

They appoint *Austin* for Divines, *Juno* for Lawyers, *Cosman* and *Damian* for Physicians (as of old *Aesculapius*)

John keeps men from Poison, *Laurentius* and *Florianus* from fire and burning (as *Vesta* of old.) *Servatius* from diseases, *Job* from the Scab, *Barbaca* from dangers, *Paul* and *John* from Tempests, *Christopher* from suddain death, *Hubert* from the biting of a mad dog.

Erasmus and *Anne* (as *Juno* of old) make men rich. *Protasius* and *Gervasius* discover thieves, *Vincentius* and *Hierom* restore things lost, *Felicitas* gives Boyes in child-bearing.

They

They set *Urbane* over the Vines (as *Bacchus* of old) *S^t Lupus* over Corn (as *Ceres* of old) *Gallus* over the Geese, *Wendiline* over Sheep, *Pelagius* over Oxen, *Eulegius* over Horses, *Anthony* over the Swine; *Medardus* has the care of Wine, *Ludovicus* *Adinorisa* of Ale, &c.

They worship fourteen whom they call Assistants or Helpers, *George*, *Basil*, *Erasmus*, *Pantaleon*, *Vitus*, *Christopher*, *Dionysius*, *Cyriacus*, *Ashacius*, *Eustachius*, *Egidius*, *Margaret*, *Barbary*, and *Katharine*.

18. The Reliques also of the Saints they worship and reverence, of which I will relate twelve errors and abuses of the Papists, as they are noted by *Chemnitius*.

1. That the bodies, ashes, or bones of the Saints are to be taken out of their graves, and placed in some high place, as upon the high Altar, or some other conspicuous place, and to be dressed with gold and silver, and silk, &c.

2. That those Reliques ought to be carried in public processions and prayers, and to be shewed and offered for Christian people to see, and touch, and kiss.

3. That such Reliques are to be approved by the Pope; and that approbation is to be by canonizing them.

4. That tis a singular and meritorious worship of God, if the people to obtain help by it, shall touch, kiss, or walk before with an adoring mind and gesture, or shall do reverence to these Reliques, by candles, silke coverings, garlands or other the like ornaments.

5. That the grace and power of God (which they say is in them or present by them) is to be sought for in these Reliques: and that they are made partakers

of it, who do touch them or behold them.

6. That 'tis an acceptable sacrifice to God, to offer up precious gifts to these Reliques.

7. Many indulgences for sin, are promised to such as touch and kiss them, &c.

8. That our prayer is the better, worthier, and more acceptable to God, if it be done by or before the Saints Reliques, by whose merits we may obtain help: And therefore in our necessities we must make Vows, and take Pilgrimages unto those places, where the Reliques of Saints are held to be, that we may call upon them for their help.

9. That it adds much to the holiness of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, if the Saints Reliques are set inclosed upon the Altar, nay that the Altar is consecrated by their touching it.

10. That the Saints Reliques may be lawfully laid over one, or carried about ones neck in devotion and faith to God, and the Saints whose Reliques they are:

11. Oaths among the Papists are taken by touching the Saints Reliques that so the obligation of the oath may be divided betwixt God and the Saints.

12. All places among the Papists are full of uncertain, counterfeit, and false Reliques, to which without difference the same veneration and honor is given.

19. They make them Pictures to worship them.

20. They dispute, that Images of God are not forbidden.

21. That Images are properly and *per se* to be worshiped.

23. That Images are to be worshiped with the same worship, as is due to the Person, or Exemplar.

24. They

24. They defend Pilgrimages to holy places, and Reliques and Saints Pictures: and they promise large indulgences to Pilgrims.

25. That the Cross of Christ is to be worshiped with the worship *Latria*.

26. That they are in some sort sanctified who touch the Reliques or the Cross.

27. That some holiness accrues to things that are signed with the Cross.

28. That the Sacrament of the Altar, or the host consecrated, is to be worshiped with *Latria*.

29. They adore the Pope as a kind of Deity.

30. The greatest part of the Popish Religion is meer superstition, and wil-worship: yea meer hypocrisie, or a form of godliness, resting in external works and observations.

31. They worship God after the commandments of men.

32. they defend the ceremonies invented by themselves or taken from Jews or Heathens to be a part of worship pleasing to God.

33. And to be observed, as the Law of God.

34. That their observation deserves remission of sin.

35. That no ceremonies appointed by the Church can be omitted without mortal sin, nor without scandal.

35. *I would they had no company in this error.*

36. That things consecrated by themselves, as holy Water, *Aguu Dei's*, &c. have spiritual effects, to drive away devils, to blot out sins, &c.

37. They conjure salt (yea and herbs) and consecrate it, that it may be healthful to the mind and body of those that take it.

38. They Baptize and consecrate the Bels, making them Godfathers, to fright away divels, and drive away Tempests.

39. That their ringing does profit the dead.

40. The Chrism being consecrated the Bishop and Presbyters salute it, in these words, *God save St. Chrisma. Ave S. Chrisma.*

41. They give it a power to confer upon the appointed health to the body, and holiness to the soul, and so the Holy Ghost himself

42. That every Church solemnely consecrated, is indued with a divine vertue.

43. The many abuses of fasting and prayer touched before.

44. They teach men to swear by the creatures.

45. They deny oaths to be fit for the perfect.

46. Vows made to the Saints they defend.

47. That the Pope can absolve from the bond of vows and oaths.

48. They consecrate feast dayes to the worship of Saints.

49. And some they consecrate to patronize their own errors as the feast of Conception, the feast of Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, the feast of Christs body, and of *Peters* chair, and of all souls, &c.

50. That feast dayes are in truth more holy then others.

51. They exempt the Clergy from the secular yoke, i. e. they exempt Ecclesiasticks, both persons and goods, from the obedience of Temporal Lords, and from their jurisdiction in personals and reals, in civil things and criminal; and therefore that the civil judge cannot punish Clergy-men.

52. That the Clergy is not bound to pay tribute to Princes.

53. That

53. That the Rebellion of a Clergy-man against the King, is not Treason.

54. That the Pope can forbid subjects to keep the oath of fidelity, to Christian Kings, if they be such as acknowledge not the *Roman* sea.

55. That the Pope can absolve subjects from the oath of fidelity.

56. That the Pope has power to depose Princes.

57. That the subjects of such Princes are bound to obey such a sentence, if it be published.

58. That if grave and learned men (*such as the Jesuites especially are*) shall judge any Prince to be a Tyrant, it is lawful for their subjects to overthrow them, and if they want power to poison them.

59. That the subjects of the most Christian Kings, whom they call *Lutherans* and *Sacramentarians*, are free from all bonds,* and that they may lawfully destroy their Kings.

60. That 'tis not lawful for Christians to tolerate a King that is an Infidel or a heretick endeavoring to draw men to his Sect, but they are bound to depose him.

61. That the ancient Christians did not depose such because they wanted power.

62. That the Pope may give the Kingdoms and Principalities, and Lordships of all those whom he judges hereticks unto his *Roman* Catholikes, or may adjudge them to those that can lay hold of them.

63. That 'tis not onely lawful, but meritorious to kill Princes that are excommunicated by the Pope.

64. They suffer Stews, and stoutly defend their toleration.

65. They forbid the Clergy to marry.

66. That Priest does better, say they, that keeps

a Concubine, then he that marries a wife.

67. That marriage after the vow of Chastity, is worse then Adultery.

68. That single life (even as it is vowed and practised in the *Roman Church*) is a worship most acceptable to God, and satisfactory for sin, and meritorious of eternal life.

69. That the Pope with a whorish intention, makes gain (as *Leno* did) by the prostitution of Whores.

70. That all faults are sold at a certain price; in the Popes Tax.

71. An officious lye they allow of.

72. They approve and teach the Mystery of equivocation.

72, 73. *This may give us some light into the jugglings of our times.*

73. The act of counterfeiting and dissembling with great men, they commend, as good and profitable.

74. They say Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.

75. That the desires of the will going before assent, are not sins.

76. Neither is concupiscence a sin in the Baptized.

77. That in concupiscence there is onely the evil of punishment not of sin.

78. By that command, thou shalt not covet, it is not forbidden, that we have no evil desires.

I have recited a huge Catalogue of errors, to which I doubt not but many more may be heaped up: As those (which we are refuting in this book) about

about Antichrist : By all which it appears , that the
 opposition of the Pope to Christs truth, is not a
 particular opposition , as in some hereticks but uni-
 versal , such as we may look for from Antichrist,
 Thus far Bishop *G. Downame*.

F I N I S.

J- 17c 1733 c, 3

~~Barthelme, Friedrich~~

THE
Safe Religion.
OR THREE
DISPUTATIONS
For the Reformed
CATHOLIKE RELIGION,
AGAINST
POPERY.

Proving that Popery is against the Holy Scriptures, the Unity of the Catholike Church, the consent of the Antient Doctors, the plainest Reason, and common judgment of sense it self.

By *Richard Baxter.*

Contra Rationem, nemo sobrius:

Contra Scripturas, nemo Christianus:

Contra Ecclesiam, nemo Pacificus,

Senferit. August. de Trinit. l. 4. c. 6. fine.

London Printed, by Abraham Miller, for Thomas Underhill at the Anchor and Bible in Pauls Church-yard, and Francis Tyton at the three Daggers in Fleet-street, 1657.

Harvard College Library
Gift of
Prof. Kenneth B. Murdock
Dec. 10, 1937



T O T H E
Protestant Reader.



When the motion was first made for the Publishing of these Papers, it seemed to me to be as the Casting of water into the Sea; so great is the Number of the Learned Writings of Protestant Divines against the Papists (which will never be well answered) that the most elaborate addition may seem superfluous; much more these hasty Disputations prepared but for an exercise which is the Recreation of a few Countrey-Ministers at a monthly meeting, when they ease themselves of their ordinary work. But upon further consideration, I saw it was, The Casting of water upon a threatening fire, which the Sea it self doth but restrain. It's more

To the Protestant Reader.

Engines than a few that are openly or secretly at work at this time, to captivate these Nations again to the Romane Pope. When so many hundreds, if not thousands are night and day contriving our seduction, under the name of Reconciling us to the Church; if no body counterwork them, what may they not do. It's not enough that we have had Defenders, and that their Books are yet in the World. Old Writings are laid by, though much stronger than any new ones: But new ones are sooner taken up and read. The Papists have of late been very plentiful, and yet very sparing in their Writings. Plentiful of such as run among the simple injudicious people in secret, so that the Countreies swarm with them; But sparing of such as may provoke any Learned man to a Confutation: That so, they may in time disuse us from those Studies, and so disable the Ministry therein, and catch us when we are secure through a seeming peace, and fall upon us when we have lost our strength. And I am much afraid that the generality of our people (perhaps of the best) are already so much disused from these studies, as to be much unacquainted with the Nature of Popery, and much more to seek for a preservative against it, and a through confutation of them. So that if Papists were once but as fully set out among us in their own likeness, as they
are

To the Protestant Reader.

are under the names of Quakers and other Sects, what work would you see in many places? I doubt many would follow their pernicious wayes, and fall like Sheep of a common rot, or people in a raging pestilence, especially if they had but the countenance of the times: Not through their strength, but because our people are naked, and unmeet for a defence.

The work that now they are upon, is, 1. By Divisions, and Reviling the Ministers, to loosen the people from their Guides; that they may be as a Masterless Dog that will follow any body that will whistle him.

2. To take down the Ministers maintenance and encouragements, that they may be disabled so vigorously to resist them.

3. To hinder their union, that they may abate their strength, and find them work against each other.

4. To procure a Liberty of seducing all they can under the name of Liberty of Conscience, that so they may have as fair a game for it as we: And ignorance and the common corruption of nature (especially so heightened by a custome in sin) doth befriend the Devils cause much more than Gods; or else how comes it to pass that the Godly are so few, and Error, Idolatry and impiety doth so abound in all the earth!

To the Protestant Reader.

5. To break the common people into as many Sects and parties as they can, that they may not onely employ them against one another, but also may hence fetch matter of reproach, against our profession in the eyes of the World.

6. To plead under the name of Seekers against the certainty of all Religion; that men may be brought to think that they must be either of the Popish profession or of none.

And indeed when all Sects have done their worst it is but two, that we are in any great danger of (And of those I think we are in more danger, then the most are aware of) And that is, 1. Papists: who plead not as other parties, onely by the tongue, but by exciting Princes and States against us, and disputing with the Fagot or Hatchet in their hands: And if we have not Arguments that will confute a Navy, an Army, or a Powder-plot; we can do no good against them.

2. Prophaneness, animated by Apostate Infidels: This is the Religion that men are born in. And men that Naturally are so endeared to their lusts, that they would not have the Scripture to be true, will easily hearken to him that tells them it is false.

Yea so much doth Popery befriend men in a vicious course, that some are apt to joy in these

To the Protestant Reader.

these together, thinking at the heart that Christianity is but a Fable: but yet for fear it should prove true, they will be Papists, that they may have that easie remedy for a reserve.

If God will preserve us but from these two dangers, Popery, and Prophaneness animated by infidelitie, it will goe well with England.

The most of my former Writings having been bent against the later; I thought it not amiss to let go this one against the former. That so I may entice the common professors to a little more serious Study of these points; and furnish them with some familiar Arguments that are suited to their capacities, that every deceiver may not find them unarmed. And here I thought it best to defend our own profession and overthrow theirs in the main, and not to stand long upon particular controversies, except that one of the Resolution and Foundation of our Faith, which is the great difference. Yet that private unstudyed men may understand wherein the particular differences lie, I have given them a Catalogue of them in other mens words in the end, as resolving not to do it in my own.

In short, I have here made it plain that Popery is against Scripture, Reason, Sense, and

To the Protestant Reader.

and against the Unity and Judgement of the Church.

1. Either Scripture is True or not true : If not , Popery is not true , which pleadeth its warrant from it (And some of them argue , as if they purposed to disprove the Scripture , and to imitate Samson , in pulling down the house on their own heads and ours , in revenge for the dishonor they have suffered by the Scripture .) If it be true (as nothing more true) then Popery is not true , which palpably contradicteih it , as in the points of Latin service , and denying the Cup in the Lords Supper , and many other is most evident .

2. Either the Catholike Church is one , or not : If not , then Popery is deceitful , which maketh this its principal pretence , for the usurping the Universal Headship . If it be One then Popery is deceitful , which is renounced by the far greater part of the Catholike Church , and again renounceth them , and separateth from them , because they will not be subject to the Pope , who never yet in his greatest height had the actual Government of half the Christian world .

3. Either the Judgement of the Antient Doctors is sound or not : If not , then the Church of Rome is unsound , that is sworn to expound the Scripture onely according to their conceit :

To the Protestant Reader.

concent : If it be sound, then the Church of Rome is unsound, that arrogate a Universal Government and Infallibility, and build upon a foundation, that was never allowed by the Antient Doctors (as in the third Disput. I have fully proved) and which most Christians in the world do still reject.

4. Either Reason it self is to be renounced or not : If it be, then none can be Papists but mad men. If not, then Popery must be renounced, which foundeth our very faith upon impossibilities, and teacheth men of necessity to believe in the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, before they believe in Christ, with many the like which are afterwards laid open.

5. Either our five Senses, and the Judgement made upon them, is certain and Infallible or not. If not, then the Church of Rome, both Pope and Council are Fallible, and not at all to be trusted. For when all their Tradition is by hearing or reading, they are uncertain whether ever they heard or read any such thing; and we must all be uncertain whether they speak or write it : And then we must not onely subscribe to Francis Sanchez, Quod nihil scitur, but also say that Nihil certo creditur. But if sense be certain and Infallible, then the Church of Rome,

To the Protestant Reader

Rome, even Pope and Council are not onely Fab-
lible, but certainly false deceivers and deceived.
For the Pope and his Council tell the Church
that it is not Bread and Wine which they
take, eat and drink in the Eucharist. But the
senses of all sound men, do tell them that it
is. I see that its Bread and Wine, I smell
it, I feel it, I taste it, and somewhat I hear
to further my assurance: And yet if Popery
be not false, its no such matter. One would
think the dullest Reader, might be quickly
here resolved, whether Popery be true or false.
Look on the consecrated Bread and Wine, touch
it, smell it, taste it, and if thou canst but
be sure that it is indeed Bread and Wine,
thou maist be as sure that Popery is a delusi-
on. And if thou canst but be sure, that it is
not Bread and Wine, yet thou maist be sure
that the Pope or his Council, nor any of his
Doctors are not to be believed. For if other
mens senses be deceitful, theirs and thine are
so too.

But these things are urged in the following
Disputations.

Its worth the observing how much they
are at odds among themselves, about the Re-
solution of their Faith, and how neer some
of them come to us of late, as in Tho.
White's Sonus Buccinae, and Doctor H.

Holden

To the Protestant Reader

Holden de Resol. fidei, and in Cressy and Vane and others may be seen : And their silly followers in England think verily, that theirs is the common Doctrine of that Church. And how solicitous Cressy and others are to take that Infallibility out of our way as a stumbling stone, which the Italians and most of them, make the Foundation and chief corner-stone. What a task were it to Reconcile but Bellarmine and Holden? Knot and Cressy (both in English.) White had so much wit in his Defence of Rushworths Dialogues, when he wrote in English, to carry on the matter as smoothly, as if they had been all of a mind. But when he writes in Latin, How many wayes of Resolution of Faith, that are unsound can he find among the Papists as different from his own? Vid. de fide & Theolog. Tract. 1. Sect. 28. 29.

Reader, Adhere to God, and the Righteousness of Christ, and the Teachings of the Holy Ghost, by the Holy Scriptures; and a faithful Ministry, in the Communion of the Saints, and as a member of the Catholike Church, which arising at Jerusalem, is dispersed over the world, containing all that are Christians; renounce not right Reason, or thy senses; and live according to the light
which

To the Protestant Reader.

which is vouchsafed thee; and then thou shalt
be safe from Popery and all other pernicious
damning errors.

Marc. 10. 165⁶.

R. B.

To



*To the Literate Romanists that
will read this Book.*

Men and Brethren,



Writing that so much concerneth
your cause, I think, should tender
you some account of its publication,
especially when I know that not onely
the divulging, but the holding of the
Doctrine contained therein, is so hainous
a matter in your eyes, that if I were
in your power, the suspicion of it might
bring me to the Rack and the Strappado,
and the confession of it would expose me
to the flames. I have many times
considered, that you could never sure
endure to torment men in your
Inquisition, and consume them to
ashes, and so industriously to embroyle
the Nations of the earth in blood and
miseries, to work them to your minds,
and set up your own way, if you did
not think it right, and think them
exceeding bad whom you thus destroy.

To the Literate Romanists.

stroy. I find that my own heart would serve me to use Toads and Serpents, and destroying Vermine, half as bad as you do Protestants, that is, to put them to death, though not to torment them so long : but for gentler and more harmeles creatures, I could not do it without a great reluctancy of my nature. I must needs therefore by your works bear you record that you have a zeal for God, but so had some before you that guided it not by knowledge, *Rom. 10. 2.* And I suppose your way is undoubtedly right in your own eyes, or else you durst never prosecute it with such violence. And yet one that was once as zealous in his way, and shut up the Saints in prison, and received authority from the high Priests to put them to death, and compelled them to blasphem, did afterward call all this but *madness*, *Acts 26. 9, 10, 11.* But methinks I find my self obliged, when I see men differ from me with such height of confidence, to give them some Reason of my differing thoughts : And yet it is no great matter of success that I can expect from this account. To make any addition or alteration in your belief, I have no great reason to expect ; while you read my words with this prejudice, that they are damnable heresie ; and depend upon him whom you suppose infallible, for the fashioning of your Faith. And
if

To the Literate Romanists.

if I should say that I expect satisfaction from you, with any great hope, I should but dissimble. For I have not been negligent in reading such writings of your own as might acquaint me both with your Faith, and your Theological Opinions; and can scarce reasonably expect that any of you should say more to satisfy me, than these contain. For any of you to recite the Canons or Decretals of your Church or Popes, in a writing to me is in vain: For I have them at hand already, or can have them at a trice. And if you say any thing to me by way of Answer, which is not in those Canons or Decretals, or solemnly pronounced already by your Church to be *de fide*, you can give me little assurance of its verity; but your own writing must incur all those rebukes, which *Knot* bestows on the Doctrine of *Chillingworth*, and we hear from you so frequently, for the defect of Infallibility. But yet, let what will come of it, I shall leave some slender Testimony to posterity, that I dissented not from so many confident men, without giving them some of the Reasons of my dissent.

I was born and bred here among the Professors of the Reformed Catholick Christian Religion. When I was young, I judged of your Profession as I was taught, and the prejudice which I received against it, did grow up with me, as yours doth against us. Yet re-
[a] ceiving.

To the Literate Romanists.

ceiving much good to my soul by *Parsons* Book of Resolution corrected (when I was but sixteen years of Age) it run much in my mind, that sure there were some among you that had the Fear of God. When I was capable of it, by Age and Studies, I made some diligent search into your Writers, that I might know the true state of the controversies betwixt us. But still I confess I read them with prejudice and partiality; till at last I attained (as far as I can understand by my own heart) such a love to the truth, and an impartiality in my Studies and judgement of these things, that I read your Writers, with as free a mind (I mean, as willing to find what truth was there to be found) as I do the Writings of Protestants themselves. When I had discovered undoubtedly that in some doctrinal points, the differences were made by most on both sides, much greater then they were, and much greater then the most Learned on both sides that had any moderation, did conceive them to be, I was the more confirmed in my resolutions to be impartial in my Studies, and so have proceeded (if I be a competent judge of my own mind) to this day. And after all, I am left in the dissatisfaction which I here manifest. And by what steps my averseness to your way hath been brought on since I began to search into it impartially, I shall here further declare.

First,

To the Literate Romanists.

First, I have been most offended with those doctrines and practices, that did most notoriously run against the stream of the Holy Scripture; for here the case was so plain that without any singular acuteness it might be discerned: as in your Latin Service of God with those that understand it not, your administering the Bread in the Lords Supper without the cup; that Image-worship which your Writers do maintain, forbidding Priests marriages, with many such like. And yet suspecting my own understanding, I read what your Writers say also for these: But when I saw how palpably they forced the text, it increased my dislike: And then knowing that you contradicted the Scriptures in *these*, and finding withal that you build your faith upon your Churches infallibility, I was exceedingly turned against your profession, when I saw your foundation so clearly overthrown. But yet this was not all: There was scarce any thing that more offended me; then the tendency of your Doctrines, to destroy the Knowledge of the people, and lead them on in ignorance, and please and deceive them by a company of ceremonies, instead of a Reasonable service of God: and the manner of your worship I could never digest. Other things did grate very hard upon those truths which I was confirmed in, but *these* went against the very bent of my heart, and

To the Literate Romanists.

crossed the very ends of my Religion and my Life. Your keeping the Scriptures from the Lay, as far as you do; and maintaining it so commonly to be the Original of Heresies to translate them into a known tongue; and making it so deadly a crime to have a Bible which they can read; with your Latin Service afore-said, and the formalities and scenical worship in which you train up the ignorant vulgar with many other things in your doctrine and practice, are such as leave me but little room for deliberation, whether I should own them or not, because they are so plainely against the very end of the Christian Religion. Had these things come under my consideration in a carnal state, when the flesh was my end, and not God I know not how I should have entertained them. But your own Doctors consent that God must be my end, and chiefly Loved, desired, and sought: And will you teach a man this, and whoodwinke him when you have done? Will you bid him love God, and keep him from the Knowledge of him? Will you bid him desire and seek him, and when you have done lock him up in the dark? Or will you bid him serve and obey him, and yet forbid him to search after the knowledge of his laws and will? If you would bring me to be of these opinions, your reasonings would be to as much purpose as if you should perswade me to put out my eyes

To the Literate Romanists.

eyes and put them in your pockets, for fear of missing my way in my race, when my life is at the stake: Or as if you should perswade me to be ignorant of Plowing and Sowing, and Merchandize, and yet to seek after provision and riches in the world. I am as easily reconciled as another to those that step out of the path that I am in, if they go towards the same end: But if you would teach me to turn my back upon Heaven, as the onely way to attain it, this will not easily down with me: I know that *God is light, and with him is no darkness*; and that *Christ is the light of the world*, and his spirit is the illuminater of the Saints, and the word is a *light to our feet, and giveth wisdom to the simple*: And yet would you have us refuse this Light, and choose the Darkness? I know that Satan is *the prince of darkness*, & a state of death is a state of darkness, tending to *outer darkness*: and that it is the saving way of God to *translate men out of darkness into his marvellous light*: And yet would you perswade me that this is the way of Life? What a difference is there between this doctrine of yours, and the very scope of Scriptures, and antient Writers, and the sense of a gracious soul? *Salomon* would have men to *Hide the commandment with them, and incline their ear to wisdom, and apply their hearts to understanding, and cry after knowledge, and lift up their voice for understand-*

To the Literate Romanists.

ing, and seek for it as silver, and search after it as for hid treasure, Prov. 2. 2, 3, 4. And is your Doctrine like this? *Isay* bids, *To the Law and the Testimony*, II. 8. 20. And the Bereans are commended for searching the Scriptures daily to see whether the things were so that were taught them even by Apostles; And will you forbid this, and burn men for to promote their salvation? Did not *Paul* write his Epistles to the Laity as well as to the Clergy? You must strip me of the grace of God, and reduce my mind to a state of darkness, before I can ever entertain these principles of darkness: For *light and darkness* will not have communion. If by Arguments you would persuade me, so plainly against the life of nature, as that I am bound to blind or kill my self in order to my good, there's somewhat within me that would confute them besides reason: And why should not the Life of Grace also be a principle of self-preservation? As for your Reason, that men must let alone the Scripture and hearken to their Teachers for fear of heresies, it will never take with me till I can believe you to be less suspected guides than Christ and his Apostles, and till I can believe that a Scholar may not learn of his Book & his Teacher both without any contradiction.

And then for your devotions, it is not all the Arguments in the world, that would ever

To the Literate Romanists.

reconcile me to them, while I have that Law in any prevailing measure written in my heart, that teacheth me to worship God in Spirit and in truth. What man of Spiritual experience can choose but distaste your way of worship, that doth but read over one of your offices, and Lady's Psalters, and see the affected repetition of words, and the ludicrous kind of devotions, which you teach the people, more like to charms than serious prayers to God! especially if he also observe the huge number of ceremonies which the very body of your worship is composed of. As there is somewhat in nature, that hindereth a man, from delighting to eat chaffe, or feeding upon meer air; so is there somewhat in the new nature of a Christian, that is against this trifling and jesting with God.

* Another thing that hath encreased my distaste of your wayes, is the common ungodliness of your

* The abominable wickedness of your party, even the *Romane* Cardinals themselves, is proclaimed by many that have been your Priests

and turned from you: as *Copley*, *Sheldon*, *Boxhorne*, and many more saith *Sheldon* (in his Survey of Rome: Miracles, p. 18. having spoken of the Cardinals Sodomy) [Believe it Reader, the abominations which are committed by these purpured Fathers, and the Supream Fathers of that Synagogue are so detestable, that they piss all narration either of modest or immodest pen.] And it's long since *Petrarch*, *Dantes*, *Aventine*, *Parisien*, *Clemangis*, *Sabellius*, *Grossthead*, *Fernus* and more of your own Writers have said enough, to satisfy us of your sanctity. Many a one that hath been cured to Popery in *England*, have been cured by a journey to *Rome*, seeing the abominations of that place.

To the Literate Romanists.

followers. I have endeavored as well as I could to be acquainted with them where I came and I have known but very few of them, but have been either Whoremongers, or Swearers, or Drunkards, or Gamesters, or sensual livers: nor did I ever meet with one to this day, to my best remembrance, that manifested a spiritual frame of heart, or had any delight to speak of the workings of God upon the soul, and the sweet communications of the love of Christ, or could give any savory account of any such spiritual workings in them: but all their Religion was to stick to the Romish Church, and go on in their ceremonious forms of worship, abstaining from this meat, or that, and rioting and pampering their flesh on Holidayes, &c. If I had known this to be the case onely of the common people in *Italy*, or *Spain*, or *France*, I should not have wondered: for I know that most of the people, do take up their Religion but upon carnal accounts, and accordingly will use it: But to find it thus in *England*, where your number is small, and you pretend to hold your Religion in so much self-denyal, the state being against you; and therefore your party should be the purest zelots, and shew the face of your doctrine in its greatest glory; this makes me judge of the tree by the fruites. And the observing of this hath made me admire,

To the Literate Romanists.

mire, that ever you can make the holiness of your Church, the matter of so great ostentation as you do: Yea that such men as *H. P. de Cressy* can have the face to pretend that your admirable holiness in comparison of ours, was the means of their conversion to you. Unhappy man! with whom did he converse while he seemed a Protestant? or where did he live? But this was not his fate alone, but of divers of his strain. When they are carnal Protestants, abhorring the power of the Religion, which they profess, and avoiding and reproaching the practicers of their own Religion, and so have no communion with them, nor experience of their holiness; it is a righteous thing with God to leave them to so much blindness, as to run from *England* to *Rome* for holiness, and that because they abhorred purity, they should be so blinded as not to discern the beauty of it, and yet to dote on the name and coate of it, which may be put on in the morning, and off at night. And indeed this hath somewhat increased my avernsness, to observe that by how much the more godly and conscionable any are of our profession, the more they are against yours: and that so few of this sort are turned to you, that I yet know not certainly of one, that ever seemed a Godly person. And the common ignorant sort of people that know not
what

To the Literate Romanists.

what a Church is, nor what Religion is, and that live in sensuality and wickedness, are the favourablest to your wayes, yea so forward to promote them that many of them would quickly be yours if the times were but changed to you; and these are the people that I have known become your proselites. When we have lost our labor upon them, and left them in their wickedness, and they that were filthy are filthy still, then some of them turn Papists, and this forsooth in admiration of the holiness of your Church: When I confess for some of them, I have not been sorry to hear that they were turned to you: for I thought, it may be the liking they have to you, might make them hearken more to your reproofs, then to ours, and possibly you might perswade them from Whoredoms and Drunkenness, and Swearing, and Lying, when we were out of hope: But when I perceived that they fled to you for an indulgence in their sin, because some of these are but venial sins with you, and they have a palliate ceremonial cure at hand to befool them; I then acknowledged the justice of God against them. I am none of those that think that there is none among you shall be saved. I have read that in some of your Writers, that perswadeth me it came from a sanctified heart. I am ready to acknowledge and honor the Spirit of Christ where-

To the Literate Romanists.

wherever I can discern it. But I must profess that I was never yet so happy as to converse with a Papist, that manifested an experienced, gracious, heavenly mind; though I am truly willing to make the best of them. And that your Church should be as the sink or channel, to receive the excrements and filth of ours, is no great argument of its holiness in my eyes. And if a few that are less sensual turn to you, it is commonly, as far as I can discern, the Tenants or servants of some of your way, that are led by worldly respects, and they are such ignorant souls that they know not what the Religion is which they are turned to, nor are able to give a reason of their change. I have spoke with some affected to your way, and some turned to it, that have thought our doctrine was yours, and yours was ours: for instance, that we taught that men might live without sin, and you taught otherwise: and have denyed that you hold the doctrine of mans merits, and divers the like. Are not these good Catholikes, and well converted, that be of our mind, and do not know it? And I observe among your own Writers, that usually those that write in the most heavenly strain, are those that give some wound to your profession, by some considerable opposition, as *Mirandula*, *Gerson*, *Bernard*, and many more.

To the Literate Romanists.

And it hath more disaffected me to your way, to observe how low the design of your Religion is, in comparison of ours: You can let the common people be as blind as Moles, and worship they know not what! And you almost confin Religion unto Votaries and Cloysters. Whenas the design of our Religion is to make the generality of our Pastoral charge more holy by far then your retired Votaries. And (as far as I am able to learn) I do verily think that there are in the small Town that I live in, some hundreds of souls, that have more true self-denyal, humility, acquaintance with the saving works of Grace, abhorrence of sin, delight in God, and believing serious thoughts of heaven, then is to be found in twenty of your Monasteries. When I am in one of their meetings which you account but a cursed Schismatical conventicle, I can behold their diligent attendance, their humble learning, their modest, orderly, serious devotions, and afterwards their painful recollections and improvement of what they learn. But among you, I should see a dumbe shew, a pompous ostentation, compounded of Ceremonies, and words which are as no words, being not by the people understood. And I am certainly informed by travellers that have known them, and by your own confessions, that you have Priests even like your people and your services. Even unlearned

To the Literate Romanists.

learned men, that are but able to read their Mass, like some of the worst of our old Readers, whom we have cast out: However you may have learned Jesuites and Fryars, that are bred up chiefly for your Theological wars, while the people that live in peace under you are famished.

It hath also much increased my disaffection, to observe, by what gross kind of cheating you carry on your cause. You make a noise with the ostentation of Miracles, but we can never see one of them, nor have certain proof of it. I confess if I could see them, they would work on me much: and I would go from Sea to Sea to see one: but I know not whither to go with the least hope of such a sight.

You talk much of perfection, and keeping the Law of God without sin: But how long will it be before you will shew us one of those sinless perfect men? I have enquired of those that I thought most likely, and they have told me that such men there be in the world, but would not be intreated to shew me one of them. Nay, it amazeth me, that you should glory of perfection, where it is so hard to find sincerity, and to meet with a man that will not curse and swear, and whore, and be drunk. Yea more to find that after this ostentation of perfection, you come so low as to make those to be perfect which we suppose to be in a damnable state:

For

To the Literate Romanists.

For how many abominable sins do you make to be venial? Do I need to tell you what some of your own Writers say of Fornication; and of a Priest rather keeping a Concubine than a wife; and what gaines have come to the Church by Whorehouses? and what a trade it is at Rome and Venice, &c. To give instance but in the sin of lying, how light do you make of it? yea you fear not to teach your English Profelytes, That [*A lye is a mortal sin, when it is any great dishonor to God; or notable prejudice to our neighbor; Otherwise if it be merely officious or jesting it is but a venial sin*] They are the words of H. T. (they say Henry Tarbertile) in his Catechism, pag. 160. Yea he saith pag. 168. That [*By this we must know when a sin is mortal, and when venial: Because to any mortal sin it is required, both that it be deliberate and perfectly voluntary.*] And then set altogether, and consider whap your Writers make of venial sin: no worse then your Doctor Thomas, saith, that [*Venial sin hath not perfectum rationem peccati, but is Analogically called sin: and that non est contra Legem, quia venialiter peccans non facit quod lex prohibet, nec pretermittit id ad quod lex per praeceptum obligat; sed facit praeiur legem: It is not against the Law, nor forbidden by it, but beside it.*] 12. qu. 88. art. 1. ad 1. And that it deserves not damnation, and eternal punishment is not due to it, but temporal only,

To the Literate Romanists.

12. q. 87. a. 5. c. & q. 88. a. 1. a. And that it induceth not a blot on the soul, 11. q. 89. a. 1. c. But onely as it hindereth the lustre of Grace, and therefore may be done away without the infusion of habitual grace, 3. q. 8. 7. 2. c. Apply this now to your last instanced case. It seems now that the Law of God forbiddeth not Lying, when it dishonoreth God but a little and not greatly, or when it is a prejudice to another but not notable; It forbids not men to lie Officially or in jest, as *H. T.* speaks. Nay it seems if you curse or swear or blasphem the name of God, or kill your own Father or Mother, it is but a venial sin, if you do it not deliberately, and perfectly voluntarily. And is not here a fine doctrine to make men perfect? Have you no way to make your selves perfect, but by making the Law of God imperfect? How can you perswade us to value such perfection? Doth *H. T.* think that a man that hath the use of Reason is not bound by God to deliberate of all the weighty actions of his life? And if a man shall kill and blaspheme in passion, and say [*I did not deliberate, and therefore it is no sin: God did not forbid it me.*] Shall this excuse him? Or is such doctrine to be endured among Christians? If God do not make it a reasonable mans duty to use his reason in the greatest things, and to deliberate of what he saith or doth, I know not what either Reason

son

To the Literate Romanists.

son or Law is made for. I think on the contrary that. [Not deliberating; especially in weighty cases is a heinous sin, and the principal cause of all other sin, in many of the ungodly. So I say of the other limitation: that (it be perfectly voluntary] Passion may make a blasphemy or murder but imperfectly voluntary, and yet that proveth not that God forbiddeth it not. For the will it self is under a Law, which puts it upon duty, and not onely restrains it from sinful volition or nolition: And therefore if the will do but suspend its act, in whole or in part, and thereby let the commanded faculties miscarry, I shall yet believe that this is forbidden, and a proper sin. What if you have a charge of the souls of your flock, and you sleep while they are misled: Or if you were a Physician, and had charge of your patients lives, and you fall asleep till they are past recovery, are you no sinner, and do you not go against the Law? Yes, you are a murderer: For though the thing be not voluntary *quoad actum voluntatis*, it is morally or imputatively voluntary, *propter omissionem actus*. If *Wolverhampton* Papists be fed with such doctrine as this, they may well be many, but they are unlikely to be good. Inconsiderateness (which I took for one of the most destroying sins) it seems is a notable preservative from sin: For be sure you deliberate not, and
you

To the Literate Romanists.

you break no Law of God what ever you do. And if there be no Law against Lying, except the lyes of the higher strain that are by *H. T.* excepted, no wonder then if Papists be Lyars.

And can you think it any injury to you if from hence I interpret, not onely many of your Historical writings (such as the Image of both Churches, &c.) but also much of the juggling that is in *England* at this day. If you put your selves in the Garbe of Quakers, Euthusiasts, Anabaptists, &c. and pretend that you are of their opinions, and deny your selves to be what you are, as long as you think that these lies are pious, and rather honor God, then *greatly dishonor* him, and rather do good to others, by promoting the Catholike cause, then *notably injure them*, can any man say, that of your opinion, that they are against the Law of God? And why call you that a venial sin, which is against no Law, when *sin is a transgression of the Law, and where there is no Law there is no transgression*, 1 *Ioh.* 3. 4. *Rom.* 4. 15. And why say you that *veniam meretur*, when yet you say that *penam eternam non meretur*! How can there be *venia sine merito vel debito pena*? What need you any pardon of that which was never deserved by you? And what need you ask forgiveness of these sins, or be beholden to God for it, if the punishment to be forgiven were

To the Literate Romanists.

never due? Will you beg the remission of a debt which is no debt? *Aquinas* makes venial and mortal sin to differ as *Reparabile & irreparabile*; because from an inward principle the one may be repaired, but the other not without infused supernatural grace. But is it ever the less sin, because it is *reparabile*? Nay what needs it reparation if it be not a transgression? But what is this Reparation that he speaks of? Is it the remission of the guilt and punishment? No sure: for eternal punishment he saith, it deserveth not; and internal principles do not sure forgive the punishment of sin? Can we forgive our selves? What is it then? Is it the removing of the blot? No: properly *peccatum veniale non inducit maculam*, as before said? Is it that venial sin is easier conquered and forsaken then mortal? No sure: For *Aquinas* tells us that a man may live for a little while without venial sin, but not long; but without mortal sin, they may easily live till death. What this reparation then is, I do not certainly know. But whatever it is, methinks it should suppose a proper sin, and not onely Analogical, an a desert of eternal punishment to be remitted.

Veniale, culpa non est, sed dispositio ad culpam. Reinerius. Cont. Waldens. ubi infra.

And here I must adde, that another thing that lately hath much disaffected me to your pro-

To the Literate Romanists.

profession, is to see by what actual fraud and juggling it is propagated. Do You think I see not the game that you are now playing in the darke in *England*, in the persons of Seekers, Behmenists, Paracelsians, Origenists, Quakers, and Anabaptists? I must confess I naturally abhor collusions and dissimulation in the matters of God. If your way were of God, it needed not such devices to uphold it, nor would it suit so well with works of darkness? If you have the truth, produce it naked, and deal plainly, and play above board! For my part I do not fear being cheated out of my Religion, by any thing but seeming force of Argument: for I mean to know what I receive before I take it, and to taste and chew it before I let it down: but the blind insatiable multitude, and half-witted giddy persons, and discontented licentious half-studied Gentlemen, may possibly be caught by such chaffe as this.

Another of your dissimulations which increaseth my dissatisfaction is, Your pretending to the ignorant people, that you are all of a mind, and there are no divisions among you, and making our divisions the great Argument to raise an odium against our doctrine, calling us Schismaticks, Hereticks and the like. When indeed no one thing doth so much turn away my heart from you as your abominable Schism. Do we not know of the multitudes of Opini-

To the Literate Romanists.

ons among you, mentioned by *Bellarmino* and other of your Writers? If you call me out to any more of this work, I mean the next time to present to the world a Catalogue of your Divisions among your selves, that it may appear how notable your unity is? If the Jesuites are to be believed, what a silly sottish generation are your secular Priests? If your Priests are to be believed, what a seditious hypocritical, cheating packe are the Jesuites? I speak not the words of your Protestant adversaries, but of those of your own Church. Do I not know what *Guiliel. de Sancto Amore* and many another say of your own Church? Do you think I never read *Watsons Quodlibets*, and the many pretty stories of the Jesuites exploits there mentioned by him? I do not think that you suffer many of your own followers to read these books that are written against one another by your selves. But the great division among you, that quite overthrows your cause in my esteem, is that between the *French* and *Italian*, in your very foundation which all your faith is resolved into. You have no belief of Scripture, nor in Christ, no hope of heaven, you differ not from Turkes and Infidels, but onely upon the credit and authority of your Church: And this Church must be infallible, or else your faith is fallible: At least it must be of sovereign authority. And when it comes to the upshot, you are not agreed
what

To the Literate Romanists.

what this Church is? One saith it is the Pope with a General Council; and another saith it is a General Council, though the Pope dissent. One saith the Pope is fallible, and the other saith a Council is fallible. One saith, a Pope is above the Council, and another saith the Council is above the Pope. And now what is become of your Religion? Nay, is it not undeniable that you are of two Churches specifically different? Certainly a body Politick is specified from the *summa potestas*. And therefore if the *French* make a Council the *summa potestas*, the sovereign power; and the *Italians* make the Pope the sovereign, and a third party make the Pope and Council conjunct only, the sovereign, are not here undeniably several Churches specifically different?

And then you have another deceit for the salving of all this, that increaseth my disaffection. You glory in your present judge of controversies, and tell us it is no wonder if we be all in pieces that have no such judge. And what the better are you for your judge; when he cannot or dare not decide your controversies? No, he dare not determine this fundamental controversie, whether himself or a Council be the sovereign power, for fear of losing the *French* and those that joyn with them. So that it must remain but *dogma Theologicum*

To the Literate Romanists.

and no point *de fide*, what is the *summa potestas*, and yet all that is *de fide*, even our Christianity and Salvation must be resolved into it? And doth not this directly tend to infidelity? Would you have serious Christians deliver up themselves to such a maze as this for the obtaining of unity? What the better are you for a judge of controverſie, in all those hundreds of differences that are among your selves, when your judge either cannot or will not determine them? Are not we as well without him as you are with him? Plain things that are past controverſie have no need of your judge! It is no controverſie with us whether Christ be the *Messiah*, whether he rose, ascended and will judge the world. And if we go to darker points, your own judge will say nothing of worse. Why do you cry out so much against expounding the Scripture otherwise then according to the sense of the Church, when your Church will give you no interpretation of them? Do not your expositors differ about many hundred texts of Scripture, and neither Pope nor Council will decide the controverſies? These are therefore meer delusions of the world, with the empty name of a judge of controverſies. And indeed you sometime shew your selves that you have no such high conceit of your Pope (whatever you would make the world believe) as to trust his judgement. Your own Priest *Walson* tells

To the Literate Romanists.

us in his *Quodlib.* pag. 56. 57. That the Jesuites
“ [Preached openly in *Spain* against Pope Six-
“ *tus* the last of all holy memory, and railing a-
“ gainst him as against a most wicked man, and
“ monster on earth: they have called him a
“ *Lutherane* heretick, they have termed him a
“ Wolf; they have said, he had undone all
“ Christendome if he had lived: and Cardinal
“ *Bellarmino* himself as judge paramount being
“ asked what he thought of his death, answer-
“ ed, *Qui sine penitentia vivit, & sine peniten-*
“ *tia moritur, proculdubio ad infernum descendit;*
and to an English Doctor of our Nation he said,
“ [*Conceptis verbis, quantum capio, quantum*
“ *sapio, quantum intelligo, descendit ad infer-*
“ *num.*] And yet we must hold our Belief in
Christ on the credit of such a mans infallibi-
lity.

But yet I have not come to that point of
your Schisme which above all things in the
world doth alienate my mind from your pro-
fession. And that is your separation from all
other Christians in the world! I find in my self
so great an inclination to unity, and the title
[Catholike] is so honourable, in my esteem,
to them that deserve it, that if I had found
you to have the unity and Catholike Religion
and Church which you boast of, it would have
much inclined me to your Church and way. But
when I find you like the Donatists confining the

To the Literate Romanists.

Church to your party, and making your selves a Sect and Faction, and unchurching and damning the far greatest part of the Christians in the world; this left me assured that you are most notorious Schismatics. When I saw so much knowledge and holiness comparatively among the Reformed Catholikes, and so much ignorance and wickedness among the Papists (even here where are but a remnant that adhere to their Religion against the course of the Nation) and when I read so many plain promises in Scripture, that *Whoever believeth in Christ shall not perish*, and that *if by the spirit we mortifie the deeds of the body we shall live*, and that *if we Repent our sins shall be forgiven*, yea that *Godliness hath the promise of this life and that to come*; and then when I find that the Papists for all these certain promises, do unchurch and damne us all, because we believe not in the Pope of Rome as well as in Christ; this satisfied me as fully that you are most audacious Schismatics, as I am satisfied that you are Papists. What! must I be a Papist on such grounds as these? Must I believe because you tell me so, that all the most conscionable heavenly Christians that I am intimately acquainted with are unsanctified, ungodly, and in a state of damnation? When I am a witness of the earnest breathings of their souls after more communion with God; When they would not live in one of those

To the Literate Romanists.

those sins that you call *venial*, for all the world; When they mortifie the flesh, and live in the spirit, and wait for Christs appearance. And yet that such as the Papists shall be saved that are so far below them, because they believe in the Pope of *Rome*? Why you may almost as well perswade me to become a Papist by telling me that you have eyes in your heads, and noses on your faces, and the rest of the world have none. Doth Christ say, *He that believeth, and repenteth shall be saved*; and must I believe that all Protestants shall be damned, let them believe and repent never so much? This is to bid me [*cease to believe Christ*] that I may believe the Pope [*Cease to be a Christian*] that I may become a Papist. I am confident I shall never be Papist, if it may not be done but by believing that all the Godly that I am acquainted with are ungodly, and in the way to hell.

And (to speak of the quantity as well as the quality) I feel a kind of *universal charity* within me; extending to a *Christian as a Christian*, and therefore to *all the Christians* in the world; which will not give me leave to believe if a hundred Popes should swear it; that the far greatest part of Christians shall be

Armeniorum Ecclesia, & Episcopum, & Indorum, & cetera quos Apostoli converterunt, non subsunt Romana Ecclesia Reinerius cont. VValdens. Catal. in Bibliothec. Par. T. 4. p. 773.

dam-

To the 'Literate Romanists.

damned, because they are not subjects to the Pope! The Papists are but a handful of the Christians in the world; at least the smaller part by far! The most of them never acknowledged the sovereignty of your Pope. And a few ages ago, before Mahometanism and Heathenism diminished the number of Christians in *Asia* and *Africa*, the Papists were but a small proportion. There are but lately taken off from the Christian Religion, its probable, twice as many as all the Papists in the whole world: If it were but the Kingdomes of *Nubia* and *Tender*, how far would they go on this account? A Bishop of your own, and Legate of the Popes that dwelt in those Countries, saith, that the Christians in the Easterly parts of *Asia* alone, exceeded in multitude; the Christians both of the Greek and Latin Churches: *Jacob. & Viriaco Hist. Orient. c. 77.* And which is more; the whole Church for many hundred years after Christ were far from being the subjects of the Pope of *Rome*: And indeed had Christ no Church till the Pope became universal Monarch? Must *Paul* be damned because he was not one of *Peters* subjects? Do not your consciences know that swearing obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, was a thing unknown for many hundred years, yea that it is a novelty in the world? Must Christ lose for ever the most of his Church, even those that never heard

To the Literate Romanists.

heard of *Rome*; because they believe not in the Pope? Never shall I be Papist while I breath, if I must be engaged to send the most of the Christians on earth, to the Devil, and that upon such an account as this. These things are so uncatholike, so unchristian, so inhumane, that I wonder and wonder a hundred times, how any learned, sober men among you, are able to believe them. For my part I am a resolved *Catholike*; that own the *universal Church of Christ*; and cannot limit my charity to a corner or a *faction*; especially to *gross a one as yours*. I own not the errors or other sins of any of the Churches, so far as I can discover them: But if I must make them Hereticks and unchurch them for these (yea even those that go under the name of Nestorians, and Eutichians) I must needs put you in among them, who I think do erre more grossly then they. But I am none of your judge: Nor none of your most rigid adversaries. I am one that have been oft called a Papist in print, for avoiding some of those extreams, into which some others have run from you. I am one that cannot choose but hope that there are thousands that shall be saved that profess themselves of your Church and way. But that I cannot do so my self, and the Reasons why I cannot do it, I have thought good here to let you know. Many more there are, but

To the Literate Romanists.

I have mentioned some of them in the following Disputations, to which I refer you. I can truly say this in the presence of the Lord that knows my heart, that if I knew it my self, I would most gladly turn Papist before I sleep if I could discern it to be the way of God: Yea if I had but any probability of it, and knew but the man that could give me satisfactory evidence on your side, I would wander from Sea to Sea to find him, as weak and unfit for travail as I am. And therefore if *any learned man among you*, have so much confidence of his way, and *charity* to my soul, as to *perswade* me to his opinion, *he shall at any seasonable time be wellcom*, and I shall thankfully entertain any evidence that he can bring, according to my capacity. But then I must desire him to deal plainly and come *bare face't*, and not to juggle under the vizor of a *Seeker*, or any other Sect; for that way will never take with me.

And I must further here profess, that this paper comes not with any cruel or bloody design against you. I write not to exasperate the Governors against you, so far as to deal unmercifully with any of you. And whereas under the vizor of the sects before mentioned you are of late so earnest in pleading for a toleration, deal but impartially like honest men, and I will set in with you, Procure but a toleration for the
the

To the Literate Romanists.

the Reformed Christian Religion in *Italy* and *Spaine* and your part of *Germany*, *Portugal*, &c. and I should willingly petition the sovereign Powers in *England* that you might have as much liberty here: But that *you* shall have *full* liberty here, and Protestants have *none* where you can hinder it, this is not equal dealing. But how comes it to pass that you that pretend so much to unity are in this also of so many opinions; the *English* Papists are for liberty of Religion, and the *Spanish* and *Italian* are against it? But I must cry you mercy: I now consider, It is but your selves that you think have right to liberty here, and others should have it but in order to yours. As hardly as you think you are used in *England*, you live openly among us, and no man that I hear of layeth hands on you: When you know if a *Spaniard* or *Italian* be known to be a Protestant, hee's as sure tormented and burnt at a stake as the coat is on his back. Do you not know this to be true? Were I in these places where your Religion hath its will, I know one leate of this book would cause me to be burnt to ashes: that I am alive is because I am not in your power: But for my part I wish not the shedding of one drop of your blood, nor your imprisonment or banishment, but only your moderate and necessary restraint from open iniquity and seducing of those that are unfurnished to encounter you.

To the Literate Romanists.

I have some invitation to make this profession, by the usage of a Justice of Peace of this County; who was so far your friend as to censure me and others for a late Gratulation, and petition to his Highness the Lord Protector, subscribed by many Justices, and by the Grand Jury and thousands of the County; and to censure the said petition to be of a cruel and bloody complexion; inserting to your honor and the reproach of the Reformed Churches; a vindication of your Religion from the guilt of the Powder-plot and Spanish invasion, and other foreign bloody acts, and charging as much on the Reformed as can be charged on you, according to the History, called [*The Image of both Churches.*] And what was this bloody petition of this County? Why? when you had murdered, and banished, and starved such a multitude of the poor Protestants in *Sarwoy*, and we were assured of it by a Narrative from the Lord Protector himself, inviting us to contribute to relieve the remnant, in the sense of your continued bloody dealings; and of the sad case of those poor people, and the favor of his Highness toward them; we returned him a thankful acknowledgement of his care, and added our desires to use the most effectual means to hinder the growth of so bloody a doctrine, lest it should reach our selves at last, yet adding that we desired no rigor as to your persons: but
craved

To the Literate Romanists.

craved the promoting of the Reformed Religion, and of unity among our selves as the means of our preservation. The world is come to a fair pass: when our brethren are murdered by thousands, we are bloody for mentioning it, and blaming you for it, and desiring our selves to be preserved from your doctrine and rage, so as without any rigor to our persons. Alas poor Protestants! When your throates are cut by the merciful Papists, you are cruel and bloody for saying so; When they have killed one half, the other half is bloody if they desire to escape. By my good will I'll never come to the Bench for Justice where this Gentleman hath power: For if I accuse a thief for robbing us, or a murderer for murdering twenty of my friends, I may on these terms expect to be accounted cruel for complaining: Yea though I adde [I pray Sir spare the person of the Murderer: onely do your best to prevent the death of the rest of my friends] I may look to be told its a bloody request. But perhaps if leisure serve I may say more to this Gentleman, in a full Reply to his paper.

Yea I am so far from desiring your blood, that I hope I have given you no abusive language. Sure I am, I come far short of the language that you give one another, where you may judge me to be most sharp. I had once very Reverend thoughts of your Father *Parsons*

To the Literate Romanists.

sons when I read his book of Resolution, and thought that if you had any good one it was he, And yet your own Priestt Watson calls him [*An Atheal stratagemitor*, pag. 160. *A bastardly Vicar of hell*, p. 157. *Fudge paramount on earth under the Diuel in Hell*, p. 156. *The arch confener*, p. 149. *That he was a bastard, dishonestly begot, basely born, a Wolsey in ambition, a Midas in immundicity, a traitor in action*, p. 108. *That all Catholikes must depend upon the Archpriest, the Archpriest upon father Garnet, father Garnet upon father Parsons, and father Parsons upon the deuill, the author of all rebellious conspiracies, treasons, murders, disobedience, heresies, and all other such diabolical and bloody designments as this wicked Jesuite hath hitherto devised*] p. 151. *One that as sure as you live on earth, doth care no more for the lives of all the Catholikes themselves, then for so many dogs lives, in a time of infectious plague.*] p. 153. *Yea (saith he) questionless he could wish in his heart, to see all the seculars and other Catholikes in England hanged rather then to be frustrate of his conceited Japonian Monarchy. Yea I verily think he would be the hangman of them all himself, rather then his platform should fail, if it stood upon so desperate a point: as a fitter office for such a base irregular bastard, then to come neer Gods holy Altar, &c.*] *Quodlib.* pag. 153. 154. I will not toul my paper with any more concerning him. •

And

To the Literate Romanists.

And of the Jesuites in general I have thought that there are among them some temperate vertuous men : but your Priest *Watson* saith, *Quodlib.* p. 346. [I call them Jesuitical, that is, the Faction of Jesuites, by a breviation, to avoid circumlocution, in one word expressing them to be a factious, seditious, ambitious, avaritious, treacherous, turbulent, Machivillian, Atheal consort, that abusing the rules of their society, and quite perverting the course, cause, institution, and intent of their order, &c.] The reasons he gives at large, p. 340. And p. 168. [The Jesuites have a special privilege in two things. One is to make all things to be believed as Gospel, be it never so false that they speak or write: another, to make all things be judged false, be it as true as the Gospel it self, that any other shall write or speak without their approbation: But if directly against them; out upon it; it is not to be heard, spoken of, or once looked upon --- And withal, the vilest parts that can be played, are counted acts of zeal among them, if done by a Father: so as it may be any way covered with either of their two principles, scilicet, *propter bonum societatis, vel ordine ad Deum.*] And p. 149. he makes their principles to be, *Omnia pro tempore, et divide & impera.* And p. 150. 151. he affirmeth that it was the Jesuites own choice and doing that the Papists had not toleration in England, because by sufferings they would

To the Literate Romanists.

have the people more passionately serve their designs.] This is the language of your own brethren (even more as well as he) but not mine.

To conclude, concerning these following Disputations, I need not tell you, that they are none of the elaborate writings of any champion of the Protestant cause, challenging your Answer: but a few hasty (yet considered) lines, delivered in a monthly meeting of a few Country Ministers, for mutual edification, by one that never pretended to much skill or will for such Disputes. If any of you have a mind to try your strength, we boldly challenge you to do it on those mentioned by me in the end: to whom let me add Dr. Crakenthorpe, especially against Spalatens. and Dallaus on several particular subjects, as de Panis & satisfact. de Imaginibus, de Ieiuniis and the rest. I pretend not in so small room to handle the particular differences between you and us, but to give my general reasons against you, and to choose out one particular about our foundation and yours. For I had read in *Costerus Enchir. c. de sum. Pont. p. 151. 152.* That *Nomen Petra plus includit quam fundamentum; fundamenta quippe edificium sustinent, Petra autem seu Rupes ipsa fundamenta, & Apostoli alii fundamenta dicuntur. Petrus vero ut Rupes solidissima, etiam fundamenta ipsa continet, & ne in errores & vitia labantur detinet autoritate pasto-*

To the Literate Romanists.

pastorali.] And Skulkenius saith Apol. pro Bell.
c. 6. p. 255. Pontificia potestas est, velut cardo,
fundamentum (& ut uno verbo omnia com-
plectar) summa fidei Christianae.
Gretser saith Def. c. 1. l. 1. de verb. Dei. p. 16.
Id solum pro verbo Dei veneramur ac suscipimus,
quod nobis Pontifex ex cathedra Petri, tanquam
supremus Christianorum magister, omniumque
controversiarum Iudex definiendo proponit.]

Bellarm. saith lib. 4. de Pont. c. 1. In con-
troversis Religionis ultimum iudicium est summi
Pontificis. & cap. 3. solum Petrum Christus vo-
cavit Petram, & fundamentum; non petrum cum
Concilio. Et ibid. Petrus & quilibet ejus suc-
cessor est petra & fundamentum Ecclesiae --- Ejus
prædicatio & confessio est radix mundi, & si illa
erraret, totus mundus erraret. --- Ex quo apparet
totam firmitatem conciliorum esse a Pontifice, non
partim a pontifice, partim a Concilio.] The Pope
then is your foundation, yea your Church;
For saith Gretser Def. c. 10. l. 3. de Verb. Dei. p.
1450. Per Ecclesiam intelligimus pontificem Ro-
manum, qui pro tempore Ecclesie naviculam mo-
deratur. Et p. 1451. Ecclesiam papam inter-
pretantur: Non abnuo.]

But the French have another foundation. But
that we renounce both yours and theirs, I
thought meet to tell you in the third Disputa-
tion. Accept this account from, Your friend

Ri. Baxter.

THE CONTENTS.

Disp. I.

QW *Whether the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant, be a safe way to salvation? Aff.*

<i>The terms explained to pag.</i>	11
<i>The first Argument</i>	p. 11
<i>The second Argument</i>	p. 14
<i>The third Argument</i>	p. 16
<i>Argument fourth</i>	p. 17. to 26.
<i>Obj. 1. True Religion is but one, answered</i>	p. 26.
<i>Obj. 2. The true Religion hath still had a visible Church professing it</i>	p. 32
<i>Obj. 3. Your Religion hath no certain test to discover it</i>	p. 40
<i>Obj. 4. You have separated from all the Churches in the world</i>	p. 41
<i>Obj. 5. You are divided into Sects, and have no unity among your selves</i>	p. 42
<i>Obj. 6. You have no infallible certainty of your Religion</i>	p. 43
<i>Obj. 7. You want many Articles of the faith</i>	p. 45
<i>Obj. 8. You condemn one another</i>	ibid.
	Obj.

The Contents.

- Obj. 9. Your titles shew you are Sectaries p. 46
 Obj. 10. You found us in possession : where was your
 Church before Luther? 47. to 52

*A Defence of Bishop Ushers Sermon of the Churches u-
 nity, against the confutation of Paulus Veridicus :
 p. 52. to 77. Wherein the common Arguments of
 the Papists against us are refellcd.*

- Disp. 2. Q. Whether Popery be a safe way to salvati-
 on? Neg. p. 78
 The term [Popery] and the rest explained, to p. 84
 Twelve propositions for the full answering of the questi-
 on p. 84
 Argument 1. Popery is built upon and resolved into a
 a notorious falsehood p. 91
 Argument 2. They hold Christianity it self on a ground
 utterly uncertain, if not, certainly false. p. 93
 Argument 3. They are disagreed among themselves in
 the very fundamentals p. 104
 Argument 4. Popery is a novel profession, unknown to
 the Apostles and Primitive Church p. 106
 Argument 5. They make a new Catholike Church p. 110
 Argument 6. They are the greatest Schismatics on
 earth p. 126
 Argument 7. Popery is an uncertain changeable thing,
 so that a man can never tell when he hath it all
 p. 128
 Argument 8. They expressly contradict the Word of
 God, and set up man above it p. 142
 Argument 9. They worship the creature with Divine

The Contents,

Worship	p. 153
The monstrosity of Transubstantiation	p. 154
Arg. 10. They turn Gods worship into scenical formalities and Ceremonies	p. 161
Arg. 11. Popery is upheld by most wicked means, and so by Satan	p. 164
Arg. 12. They adde to all, impenitency and incurableness	p. 171
Arg. 13. It plungeth men into certain perjury	p. 172
Objections for Popery. Obj. 1. It is delivered down from the Apostles: p. 175. Obj. 2. They are a true Church: p. 177. Obj. 3. A Papist may be saved: p. 179. Obj. 4. There is but one true Church, and thats theirs	p. 180
Obj. 5. They have unity, universality, antiquity, succession: p. 181. Confuted.	

Disp. 3. Q. Whether the infallible judgement of the Roman Pope and his Clergie must be the ground of our belief of the Christian doctrine, or of our receiving the holy Scriptures as the word of God? Neg.	p. 186
The Resolution of the Protestants faith	ibid.
The Popish confusion about the resolution of their faith	p. 189
Three questions contained in this one. 1. Whether the Pope and his Council be judge of controversies? The truth opened in ten propositions	p. 195
Arg. 1. p. 199. Arg. 2. p. 200. Arg. 3. p. 202. Arg. 4.	p. 203
Obj. Shall every illiterate person be judge of the sense of Scripture?	p. 205
Q. 2. Whether the Pope be infallible in this decisive judgement which he pretendeth to?	p. 208.
What	

The Contents.

<i>What infallibility we hold</i>	p. 209
<i>An answer to that which Bellarmine saith for the Popes infallibility</i>	p. 213. to 221
<i>An answer to Knots arguments against Chillingworth</i>	p. 221. to 240
<i>Arg. 2. against their infallibility from common sense</i>	p. 240
<i>Argument 3. from experience :</i>	p. 248. <i>arg. 4.</i> p. 152.
<i>arg. 5.</i> p. 253. <i>arg. 6.</i> p. 256. <i>arg. 7.</i> p. 257. <i>arg. 8.</i> p. 258. <i>arg. 9.</i> p. 259. <i>arg. 10.</i> p. 260. <i>arg. 11.</i> p. 262.	
<i>arg. 12.</i> p. 267. <i>arg. 13.</i> p. 267. <i>arg. 14.</i> p. 268. <i>arg. 15.</i> p. 207. <i>arg. 16. & 17.</i> p. 272. <i>arg. 18.</i> p. 274.	
<i>arg. 19.</i> p. 277. <i>arg. 20.</i> p. 278.	
<i>Q 3. Whether our faith must be resolved into the infallibility of the Romane authoritative judgment</i>	p. 278
<i>Two more Argu. against the Popes judgment</i>	p. 279
<i>That we must not receive our Religion on the credit of his judgement, manifested in twenty queres</i>	p. 281
<i>How Dr. H. Holden shuns the circle</i>	p. 282
<i>The ancient Fathers and Church fully against them</i>	p. 295. to 351
<i>Their Obj. against us for our want of infallibility, answered</i>	p. 351. to 356
<i>More out of antiquity against them</i>	p. 357. to 364
<i>Their own usuraption against Scripture</i>	p. 365
<i>Vincentius Lirinensis against them</i>	p. 368. to 373
<i>Dr. Fields Catalogue. of Popish errors</i>	p. 375
<i>Appendix, Bishop Downnames Catalogue of Popish errors :</i>	p. 381. to the end.

Errata.

Errata.

Page 11, line 33. read go p. 12. l. 21. dele is p. 12. l. 25. r. from
p. 20. l. 8. r. neck p. 22. l. ult. d. purposely p. 29. l. 3. r. good p.
34. l. 22. r. satisf. story .38 l. 28. r. m p. 38. Mar. So Dr. White,
&c. should be printed p. 39. l. 20. d. not p. 44. l. 13. r. the p. 48.
l. 9. r. > here p. 48. l. 24. r. decide's p. 50. l. 1. r. symptoms p. 52. l.
33. r. Egyptian Ch i'ians p. 58. l. 6. r. Sacram. l. 7. r. Boetius. 25.
d. and the Maronites l. 25. v. the p. 59. l. 24. r. cause, or as p. 60. l. 11.
r. The Lutheran p. 63. l. 26. r. will and p. 74. l. 1. r. of most of the p.
74. l. 26. d. and by obsequation p. 76. l. 30. held p. 86. l. 1. r. Councils
p. 86. l. 24. r. diffident l. ult. r. on p. 91. l. 29. r. seated p. 101. l. 30.
r. John and p. 107. l. 17. r. necessarily p. 108. l. 8. r. new l. 14. r.
conclis l. 14. r. tractarentur p. 114. l. 28. d. to be new p. 125. l. 29.
r. Tenuum p. 120. l. 17. r. consequence p. 122. l. 1. r. name p. 130. l.
29. r. there p. 131. l. 3. r. and p. 134. l. 24. d. not p. 135. l. 2. r. an un-
interrupted p. 138. l. 14. r. school 140. l. 13. r. they l. 32. d. (op 146.
l. ult. r. proci binc p. 148. l. 1. r. last p. 149. l. 26. r. 17, 18, 19. p. 154.
l. 1. r. his p. 166. l. 22. r. they may p. 167. l. 11. r. Bollec p. 172. l. 1. d.
map .75. l. 26. r. i. p. 17. l. 25. r. safe way l. ult. d. is p. 187. l. 27.
add by p. 189. Mar. add some 192. l. 4. add and p. 202. l. 22. r. us
p. 209. l. 7. d. the p. 226. l. 2. r. mentioned l. 2. r. was l. 26. r. unque-
stionably p. 233. l. 1. add not p. 243. l. 7. r. illuding p. 247. l. 9. d.
self p. 249. Mar. r. Kramius p. 250. l. 10. r. the many second l. 27.
add not 251. l. 15. r. decrees p. 255. Mar. r. succeeding p. 268. l. 33.
r. will p. 273. l. 21. r. episcopis p. 282. l. 25. r. ibi p. 283. l. 11. r.
expertum p. 284. l. 2. r. the p. 287. l. ult. r. impatiio p. 286. l. 7. r.
apertum p. 29. l. 21. d. is p. 308. l. 18. r. judicial p. 309. l. 28. r. con-
fute p. 314. l. 28. r. theirs p. 331. l. 17. r. Montanus p. 333. l. 8. r.
Tatianus p. 41. l. 12. r. cancrip 342. l. 1. r. suburbaniis l. 32. r.
beaded p. 343. l. 16. r. 10 us p. 348. l. 2. r. Roman l. 4. r. authors p.
355. l. 10. r. word l. 23. r. proverb p. 356. l. 2. r. vasher than p. 358.
Marg. add del. 28. r. literis p. 359. l. 31. r. securus p. 364. l. 11. d.
i. c. p. 366. l. 8. r. Glor p. 370. l. 8. r. fuisse p. 371. l. 28. add not
l. 3. add other p. 377. l. 5. r. knew l. 28. r. the p. 380. l. 23. r. in p.
379. l. 12. r. catalogus. p. 217. l. 32. after [faith] adde [Or the
object of faith, even Christ himself (which indeed is the true sense,
agreeable to 1 Cor. 10. 4. And that Rock was Christ.)]



Q U E R Y.

*Whether the Reformed Catholike
Christian Religion, commonly
called Protestant, be a safe
way to Salvation?*



THE great business of the Diuel the
Enemy of Mankinde, is to keep man
from that Salvation, which Christ
hath so dearly purchased, so graci-
ously offered, and hath appointed us
such excellent helps to attain : To which end it is
his first endeavor, that men may not know or Believe
that there is such a Felicity, and what it is, and
how much to be desired ; and *his next*, to keep them
from knowing the way to it, and the *last* is, to keep
them from walking in that way when they know it.

B

By

By the first means he keeps from Salvation, all Atheists and Heathens that know not, or believe not the life to come: by the second, all Infidels that Believe not Christ to be the way, and all Hereticks that Believe not those Truths which are of absolute necessity in subordination to Christ: and by the third, all Hypocrites and un sanctified, ungodly, impenitent men, in the visible Church, that yet have a superficial Belief of these Truths.

Our Question in hand is for the escaping the second of these snares, by discovering which is the *safe way to Salvation*? The Policy of the Devil hath always endeavoured to hinder the world from knowing this way, by these two means: First, if it be possible by keeping them in utter darkness, that this way may not be revealed to them, or being revealed, may not be understood: Secondly, or if that will not do, by making such a number of by-ways on every side, that the true and onely way may hardly be discerned. And this is his end in raising so many Heresies; and this is the course he takes to mislead them that have escaped from the darkness of Infidelity. He begun this trade betime, even in the dayes of the Apostles: They saw the multifarious off-spring of the Deceiver sprouting up apace in their own times: yet did it never enter into their thoughts to tell the Church, that by this, all Heresies should be known, *That the Church of Rome should condemn them*, or to send it down to all posterity as the true touchstone to tell them which was the onely right way among all these Heresies, to wit, *That which is believed by the Pope or Church of Rome*. This had been a ready and easie way for the Apostles to have prescribed, and for us to have received, if it had been true. It might

might have saved them much labor in giving us that Body of sacred Doctrine which they have made indeed the Touchstone of the *safe way*; and it might have spared us much more labor of searching and studying which is the way; and we might all have sent to *Rome*, and been resolved without any more ado. Surely the Apostles were not so envious to our ease and safety, as to have silenced this easie way if they had known it themselves. But as every Heretick when he findeth out a New way, doth condemne the Old, as inconsistent with his New, so do the Papists; Since this new way hath been cryed up, that [*No man can come to heaven but by Rome*] it is their business to deter people from any other way, and to that end, to tell them that there is no safe way but theirs. As the Quakers tell us, that there is no way to Heaven but theirs, and some * Anabaptists say there is no way to Heaven but by being Baptized (again as they are) so do the Papists tell us that there is no way to Heaven but by Believing in the Pope and Church of

* Much contrary to *Da. masceus*, who saith that the Rebaptized do crucifie Christ again, *Orthod. fid. li. 4. c. 5. p. (mibi) 296.* (Though I suppose he is as far on the other side.)

Rome, and obeying him as the head of the Church. I never saw the place, but sure that Town hath some admirable excellency in it, that the God of Heaven should so much set his heart upon it, as to endow it with such a stupendious Prerogative, that no man should be saved from everlasting Torment that doth not Believe in the Bishop of that City, and obey him as the universal head. Its a wonder to me, that he that set not his heart so much on his Temple at *Jerusalem*, or on that chosen people; as not to for-

take them for their sins, and that hath the Heavens for his Throne; and to whom the Sun it self is as Darkness; should yet be so taken with a Town called *Rome*, built and long inhabited by Idolaters, defiled with the blood of thousands of Martyrs; against which the souls under the Altar cry out [*How long Lord Holy and true wilt thou not avenge our blood &c.*] as to ordain that no man in the remotest parts of the world, even the Antipodes that never heard of the name of *Rome*, can be saved, though he should never so much believe in Jesus Christ, unless he Believe in the Bishop of this Town and obey him: when yet with *Andradius* and other Papists, its a hard question whether a man may not be saved in those heathen Countries without believing in Christ himself. Is it not a marvaile that we never read that *Rome* was once named by Christ himself, and that it never was put into our Creed as one of the necessary Articles to salvation? especially when we find there the *Catholike Church*, and Communion of Saints, which sure would have been some way intimated to be the *Romane Church* or that which is headed by their Bishop, if it had been so indeed. I find but three names (strictly so called) in the Creed, and the Popes or *Romane Churches* is none of them: One is Jesus Christ, and the other is hers that bore him, and the third is his, that Judged him to death; and this indeed was a *Romane* name, and if the honor of it in the Creed will do them any service, let them make their best of it.

But however, this advantage the enemy of the Church hath got by it, that the new *Romane Title*, hth made the old *Catholike Title* seem questionable to many, and now so great is the audacity of the usurp.

ing Pope, that he not onely questioneth whether any Christians shall be saved that believe not in him as well as in Christ, but he flatly denyeth it; and what he cannot get by Scripture and reason, he would get by threatning and terrible words to affright the simple, telling them that Protestants are not of the true Church or Religion, nor in a safe way to salvation, because they will not be the subjects of the Pope of Rome: Well, we shall briefly prove our way to be safe, if not to the satisfaction of perverse, ambitious, or passionate and prejudiced men, yet I doubt not to the satisfaction of all humble, impartial, diligent persons, that are willing to know the truth, and deny themselves, that they may know it, and do not stifle it by their lusts, or imprison it in unrighteousness in their byassed resolutions. And first we shall briefly open the termes,

By * [Religion] here we mean, the * Religion in
 Doctrine de credendis & agendis, A-2 the first sence
 seems to be
 (as Martinus) *propiet a. Tid ofus qui res divinas studiose Religis;*
piciatis ergo, though the word be thence variously used.

(1) Lactantius saith (Instit. li. 4. c. 28.) *Hac conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos Deo justa & debita obsequia prebeamus, hunc solum noverimus hunc sequamur. Hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti Deo & Religati sumus: unde ipsa Religio nomen accepit; non ut Cicero interpretatus est a Religendo. Melius id nomen Lucetius interpretatus est, qui ait, Religionum se nodos exolvere.* Hierome in c. 9. Amos, & August. de via Rel. c. 55. & Retract. l. 1. c. 13. & li. 10. de Civit. Dei. c. 4. are for the same derivation.

(3) Macrobi. Saturn. li. 3. c. 3. *Servius Sulpitius Religionem esse dictam tradidit quia propter sanctitatem aliquam remota ac seposita a nobis sit, quasi a relinquendo dicta, &c.* vid. Martin in verb. Sometime Religious is taken for the same with sacred, and so is applyed to Persons, Actions, Things, Places, Time, &c. we here take it for a prescribed way to salvation, or that which by us is Believed or professed to be such: and this is our Religion.

bout matters to be believed and practised, which we hold and profess as of Divine Revelation, and injunction, in order to Gods Glory and our salvation. For though this be but the means towards those holy Affections and practices which are of nearer necessity to our salvation, as being the necessary effects of the former, yet is it not this later; but the former that we are now inquiring after: Not of *Subjective*; but *Objective* Religion: not of the *fides quā*, but the *fides quā creditur*: not whether we be true to our Religion and so truly Religious, but whether we be of the True Religion, or hold that Doctrine which will save them that are true to it, in Belief and Practice. I shall not much stop the plain Reader therefore with any further and unnecessary inquiry into the Etymology of the word Religion, which some derive (1) a *Religendo*, some (2) a *Religando*, and some (3) a *Religendo & Relinquendo*: But as long as we understand what is meant by the word, we shall not stick at the Etymology or propriety.

By the [*Reformed*] Religion, we mean, the Christian Catholike Religion, as it is separated from Popery: and so by this word we do distinguish our Churches from the *Romane* Sectaries. For, it is not every Reformation (much less every thing so called) that here we have respect to, but the Reformation by which we cast off Popery it self, which because it was in one Countrey done by a solemn Protestation of certain Princes and Cities against Popery, hath been since called the Protestant Reformation, and our Churches the Protestant Churches and our Religion, the Protestant Religion.

Our Religion is called *Catholike*, because it is the Religion of the *Catholicke Church*, which is so called a καθολικη, because it is universal, consisting not onely of Jews and their Proselytes, as heretofore, nor of one Town like *Rome*, and those that will be the subjects of the Bishop of that Town, as the Papists dream, but of all that Believe in the name of Christ through the whole world, holding the Tradition or points of absolute necessity to salvation, and not again denying them by any such contradicting Errors, as will not consist with the practical belief of the said Fundamentals.

As that was called *A Catholike Epistle*, which was directed to the whole Church, and not to any one person or people; so is that the *Catholike Church* which containeth all Christians.

As *Austin* was wont to describe it against the Donatists (who would have confined it to the adversaries of *Cacilianus* and followers of *Donatus* in *Affricke*) that the true Church was that which was spread over the world by the Gospel which was commanded to be preached to all Nations, beginning at *Jerusalem*: so do we.

By the *Christian Religion*, I suppose we are agreed, is meant the Religion of Believers in Christ, or that whereof Christ is the Foundation and prescriber, and faith in him the first act, which must contain all the essential parts (though it may possibly want many integrals) or else it is not to be called the Christian Religion. They that were called Christs Disciples were afterwards called Christians first at *Antioch*, *Act. 11. 26*. To be a Christian therefore, and to be Christs Disciple is all one.

Note therefore, that as the word *Religion* denot-

eth the sum of doctrines and way of salvation absolutely necessary; so it is but *One* in all the world (that's true and saving) and that is the *Christian Religion*. So that if a Heathen, Jew or Mahometane ask me what Religion I am of, in opposition to theirs, I will say, I am a Christian, and not onely that I am a Protestant: But if a Christian aske me what Religion I am of, I will say, I am a Reformed Catholike Christian: for such a question in the mouth of a Christian usually implieth that I am a Christian, and intendeth the discovery of what sort or party of Christians I belong to. But indeed Christianity is not many but one, and therefore Christians as *Christians* are not of many Religions, but of one: No nor Christians at all, that are truly such, if by Religion you mean, a *systeme of doctrines in the main, necessary or sufficient to salvation* (or conceited so to be). For, as there is no such Body of Doctrine but Christs, so no man that is indeed a Christian, can believe that there is, seeing such a Belief contradicteth the essentials of Christianity. But among those that call themselves Christians, there are some Hereticks that deny or plainly subvert some part of the essentials of Christian Religion. And among those that are Christians, some have such dangerous corruptions as do much hazard the salvation, and tend to frustrate them of their benefits of the Christian Faith, and these very corruptions they Entitle by the name of Part of their Religion, as the Papists do: In which sence I must say, I am not of the same Religion with them, though I hold the same Christian Doctrine as they, because I hold not their mixture, and add nor those corruptions which they make a part of their Religion.

The

The name *Protestant* I reject not, because it was taken up on a just occasion: but I take it to be too extrinsecal, and private to be the standing denomination of my Religion; as being not taken from the nature of the thing, but from an occasionall action of a few men in one Countrey; though it intimateth that all of their judgement in all other Countries, do virtually at least make the like Protestation in the maine. I do therefore rather choose to say that I am a *Reformed Catholike Christian*; and when I call myself a Protestant, this is my meaning.

So that by the name [*Christian*] which expresseth all my Religion it self Positively considered, I am differenced from Heathens, Jews, Mahometans, and all Infidels, and those (by some called Hereticks) who usurpe the name of Christians, while they deny part of the very essentials of Christianity. And by the name [*Catholike*] I adde nothing Positive to the former, but onely intimate that I am of the Universal Church, and negatively exclude my self from all divided parties, or from any that are yet in that Church, and yet take up any dividing titles or wayes therein, though they withdraw not from it; as they are such, I am none of them, and therefore disclaim (when I exprefs my Religion) such private names; I am no *Lutheran*, *Calvinist*, *Arminian*, *Papist*, *Socinian*, &c. but a *Catholike*.

But yet when I say I am a *Reformed Catholike*, I purposely disclaim the Corruptions of Popery, and in that word renounce their Errors as such, as by the word *Catholike* I renounced their Schisme: And so I may agree with *Luther*, *Calvin*, or any man in Reformation, so far as they hold to the word of God: so that if malicious adversaries will put the name of

Sect upon the Catholike verity, and call it by the name of *Zuinglianisme*, *Lutheranisme*, *Calvinisme* or the like, pretending that it had its Spring from these men, they shall not by such unworthy means, remove me from the Catholike Religion, nor yet cause me to own their Corruptions, because they have named the opposition of them as a Heresie. *Augustine* would not turn *Donatist*, because they named the Catholikes *Cacilians*; nor would *Prosper* turn *Pelagian*, because they called the Orthodoxe, Predestinarians or Fatalists, nor would *Athanasius* before them turn *Arrian* because they called the Orthodoxe Tritheists. It is not other mens fastening upon us the name of a man, or of a Sect that proves us Sectaries, or that we had our Religion originally from that man. Yet do we so much reverence their names, that we rejoyce in their labors for the Church, and bless God for them, and endeavor to imitate them in their holy doctrine and lives, though we make none but Christ the Lord of our Faith.

As for the terms of the predicate they need no great explication. By *salvation* we mean principally Everlasting Glory in Heaven: By the way to it, we mean the means appointed by God for the attaining it. The principal means indeed is Christ himself, who is eminently called, The way, and no man cometh to the Father but by him. But in subordination to Christ all other means are the way.

By a *safe way*, we mean a way that *in suo genere* is sufficient to the attainment of the end; so that all that sincerely are that way shall attain that end; A certain means of happiness to all that faithfully use it.

For

For it must be known that no Religion (or sound Doctrines) will save a man that is not faithful in the reception and improvement of them. A True Religion will not save him that is not True to his Religion. And therefore it is no wonder if multitudes even of Protestants do perish, though their Religion be the onely Religion in the world. For they are not heartily of the Religion which they profess. They have that doctrine which is the seal, and fit enough of its own nature *quantum in se* to imprint the image of God upon their souls: But if they keep this seal in their Chests, and apply it not effectually to their hearts, they may have unholy hearts and lives, though they profess a holy faith and Religion, and therefore may perish for all that profession; yea and perish most deplorably because their profession doth aggravate their sin. If a mans Religion (or believed doctrines) be bad in the maine, the man himself must needs be bad too; and therefore no man of such a Religion can be saved: But if a mans Religion (or professed doctrines) be never so good it is possible he may be bad that doth profess them: and then no Religion can save a wicked man. So that of the true Religion some are saved, but not all: but of a bad Religion (in the main) no man can be good, or be saved.

I come to the Arguments by which I prove the Affirmative, that [*The Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant, is a safe way to salvation.*]

Arg. 1. That Religion which best agreeth with the word of God, above all other Religions in the world, is a safe, yea the safest way to salvation: But the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion
com-

commonly called Protestant, doth best agree with the word of God: therefore it is the safest way to salvation.

One would think among Christians the Major should be unquestionable: But here the corrupt *Romanists* have presumed to make a new word of God, that so the determination of the case might be impossible, unless we will go up to these Philistines to sharpen our weapons: For they deny the holy Scripture to be the whole word of God, or sufficient to be the Rule for deciding of controversies in matter of faith, and tell us, that unwritten Traditions are another part: And those Traditions are such as are received by the whole Church as delivered down from the Apostles, and that whole Church is onely the *Romane* party: and thus do they by their own Authority undertake to damne all the rest of the Christian world, and make themselves onely the Catholike Church: and by this trick of wit they have got one half of Gods word into their closets, and that it is his word, which they say is his word: And that you may know that they are no blabs or revealers of secrets, they have for some hundred years kept this close, as a secret to themselves, yea from themselves as well as to us: so that when the common Proverb takes that to be a secret which one or two knows, but not when three know it, yet these men have a word of God which all the Catholike Church is the keeper of, and yet those that keep it, know it not themselves, much less can we that stand by come to the knowledge of it; but we must all wait till the last Pope have breathed out his last determination, before the Catholike Church that is said to keep it can come to know what is the whole

whole word of God. And so among them it is come to this pass, that to be judged by Gods word, is to be judged by the Pope and his entrusted Subjects.

But if any man whatever bring us forth a Tradition, and say, that this is the word of God and came down from the Apostles, we shall desire more then his word for the proof of it. And when he brings us as good proof that his Tradition came from the Apostles, as we shall bring him that the Scripture came from them, then will we cheerfully receive his Traditions: but not without sufficient proof, upon the boastings of corrupted interested men.

As for the Minor, that our Religion is most agreeable to the Scriptures, I shall now say but this to the proof of it. First, we take the Scriptures for the only Test or Rule of our faith and practice; and we tye not our selves to any other by-rule which may force us to a misunderstanding of it. It is onely the Scripture that we still profess doth contain our Religion: And it is the chief part of the quarrel between us and *Rome*, that they will not take this word for the perfect or sufficient Rule of Judgement. It is this word onely that we appeal to, and desire to be judged by: And the Papists wilful declining of this Tryal and Judgement doth give any impartial observer sufficient cause to suspect, that they take the Scripture to be against their cause, or else why should they not have as much confidence in it, and commit their cause to it as well as we.

2. To run over every point of difference between us and them, and prove our part by Scripture, would be a very easie work, but it would make this Disputation swell too big. And it is done so largely
and

and often already by our Writers that it is less necessary. If any of them complain for the omission of this part, let him but assure me that he will stand to the Judgement of Scripture, and I shall quickly and willingly enter the lists with him, and go over this part of the task again. In the mean time let it suffice to tell young Students, that *Amesius* his *Bellarminus Enervatus* hath spoiled all their cause of this defence and manifested Scripture to be fully against them, in a little room; which may spare them the reading of many larger. And for the meer *English* Reader, Mr. *Ri. Bernard* in his book called, Look beyond *Luther*, in his help annexed to it, hath given a brief and effectual discovery that Scripture is not on their side, in an enumeration and proof of many of the points in difference, between them and us: which for brevity, I refer them to.

In a word, if the Scripture be true, then that Religion which agreeth with them is a safe way to salvation: But the Papists confess that the Scriptures are true: Therefore &c. The Major is plain, in that Scripture affirmeth of it self, that it is able to make us wise unto salvation, and furnish us to every good work, and is written that we might believe, and believing might have life in Christs name, &c. *Joh. 29. 31. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17.* Of which we have said somewhat in a short Determination of that Question by it self.

Arg. 2. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, by which the Apostles and the Churches in their days were saved: But by the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, now called Protestant, were the Apostles and the Churches in their dayes saved: therefore it is a safe way to salvation.

The

The Major with reasonable men needeth no proof. There is not many Religions but only one that are a safe way to Salvation: and that which the Apostles went in and the Churches in their dayes, is undoubtedly that one. God hath not since taken down that Religion and set up another, and made that way safe to us, which was unsafe to them.

The Minor is thus proved, The Apostles and Churches in their dayes were saved by that Religion which is contained or expressed in the holy Scriptures: But that is the same with this which is called the Protestant Religion. For proof whereof I refer you, and offer as abovesaid. Yeeld once that Scripture shall be the Rule to judge by, and the controverſie will soon be ended betwixt us.

And I need not to say but these two things for proof of the point.

1. That their own Writers confess that the Affirmative or Positive part of our Religion, as it was here in *England* professed, was not against the word of God, contained in the holy Scriptures, only they told us that the Negatives were, of which we shall consider further anon.

2. As it is the great care of the Papists to keep the Scriptures from the people, accounting it the Original of Heresies to have them translated (as *Arboreus* and many expressly say) and burning men to ashes for reading the Scriptures, when God will burn them in Hell, if they obey them not (which they are not like to do without knowing them) so experience hath convinced them that where the reading of the Scriptures in a known tongue is but permitted, there doth our Religion most encrease, and Popery decay; so that if this one means were but
per-

permitted, in *Spain* and *Italy* as it is, whether they will or no in other parts, undoubtedly the Popes Kingdom would soon come down: I say, if they durst but permit men to read the Word of God in a known tongue. They know this well enough, or else they would never so torture poor Christians by the Inquisition for having a Bible in their houses. They have sure some humanity in them, as well as others: and therefore could never go so exceeding far beyond the Turke in Cruelty to Christians themselves, but that they know their whole cause and Kingdom is concerned in it, and if once Scripture get in, they are gone. In a word, multitudes of volumes have already proved that Scripture is against Popery.

Argu. 3. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, in which the Church in the three or four first Ages at least was saved: But the Church in the three or four first Ages at least was saved in that Catholike Christian Religion, which now is called the Reformed or Protestant Religion: Therefore this is a safe way to salvation.

I mention not the former Ages as if all other following Ages had come to heaven by any other Religion, then the former; but 1. because in them alone there is a sufficient proof of the Major Proposition: None could be saved in it, especially not so many Ages of the purest times, if it were not a safe way. 2. Because some Popish Errors began among the worser sort of Ambitious, Superstitious Prelates to creep in betimes; and Popery it self appeared in the world soon after the six hundredth year, and was openly established about the thousandth year. And according to the degrees of corruption in the Church

Church there was a greater difficulty of salvation ; because more impediments : but still those that were saved, were all saved in and by the same Religion of the former Ages ; and if they were saved in any Corruption, yet not *By* it, but *from* it, or against it.

As for the proof of the Minor as it requireth a full volume of it self, to produce the particular Testimonies of the Fathers for us, so is it already done in many Volumes : And because the continual clamor of the Papist, is, that Antiquity is on their side, I shall anon disprove them in the fundamental difference between them and us, in the following Disputation, about their pretended Sovereignty and Infallibility ; and in other particulars desire them to give some reasonable answer to what is already alleged by Bishop *Usher*, Dr *Field*, and many more of our Writers, before they expect we should regard their vain immodest pretences : And still let it be remembred that for all the Positive part of our Religion, they themselves cannot deny but that the Churches still held it. Our Religion is the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures ; and doubtless that was entertained by all the Churches ; and in that Religion they were saved.

Argu. 4. That Religion is a safe way to Salvation, whose faithful Professors have a promise of Salvation made them by God in his holy word : But such is the Reformed Catholike Christian Religion, commonly called Protestant : therefore it is a safe way to Salvation.

The Major cannot be denied : for God cannot lye, or break his promise. And the Minor is easily proved by parts. Our Religion is to believe all that

is in the Holy Scripture to be the true word of God : and more particularly we believe all the Articles of the Creed called the Apostles', the *Nicens* Creed, and that of *Athanasium* ; with the Doctrine of the Sacraments of Baptisme and the Lords Supper, and we confess that in a larger sence other sacred mysteries may be called Sacraments : we believe that every man must unfeignedly Repent of all sin, and turn from it to God, and Love God above all, and his neighbor as himself, and faithfully obey the whole revealed will of God ; with other particulars which may be seen at large in our several confessions. And he that faithfully Believeth and doth all this, hath many promises of Salvation in the Scripture, *John 3. 26.* *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.* But Protestants believe in him ; and subvert not, nor nullifie that belief by any contradiction ; therefore they shall not perish (if they be true to their profession) but have everlasting life.

Mark. 16. 16 *Go and preach the Gospel to every creature : he that Believeth and is Baptized shall be saved.* But Protestants believe and are baptized.

Obj. So Hereticks and wicked men may say. *Ans.*

But not truely : For 1. Hereticks truly so called, that cannot be saved, do not Believe the whole Doctrine which is fundamental or of Absolute necessity to Salvation. Let them shew that by us if they can.

2. As Hereticks have not the true faith, so wicked men are not true in the faith : The former want the *fides quæ & quæ* both, that is, both true objective and subjective faith : and the later want true subjective faith at least. And so they will confess

that

that many a Pope hath done.

Rom. 10. 9. *If thou confests with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* For with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. But thus do the Protestants; therefore they shall be saved.

The Doctrine which *Peter* preached to *Cornelius* was sufficient to save him and all his house, *Act. 10. 14.* But every word of that is believed by the Protestants, therefore it may save them.

The Jaylor is promised, *Act. 16. 31.* that if he will believe on the Lord Jesus Christ he shall be saved. So *Heb. 10. 39.* *Luk. 8. 12.* It is not said, If thou wilt believe in Christ and the Pope of Rome thou shalt be saved, *Act. 4. 12.* [*Neither is there Salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved*] Therefore not the Popes name. In *Act. 15. 1.* It's said that certain men came down from *Judaea* taught the brethren, that except they were circumcised after the manner of *Moses* they could not be saved: against these *Paul* wrote the Epistle to the *Galatians*, where you may see how to think of such: And in the like manner do the Papists teach men, that except they believe in the Pope of Rome, and except they believe that there is a Purgatory, and that Images may be worshiped, and that the consecrated Host may be adored, and that we may pray to Saints departed, and that the Priest must take the Sacrament while the people only look on, and that only the Priest must receive it in both kinds, and the bread alone may serve the people, and that prayers

and other Church-service should be in the Latine tongue when the people understand it not, with abundance more of their vile inventions, I say, those that believe not all this, they say cannot be saved: But what say the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at *Jerusalem*, when the former case is brought before them? They would not have men tempt God, by putting a yoke on the most of the Disciples, but believe that through the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, those that used none of those ceremonies should be saved as well as the Jews, *Vers.* 10, 11. And the sum of their Deerees or answer is, that [Those men who went out from them and troubled people with such words, did but subvert their souls, by saying that they must be circumcised and keep the Law, and that they gave them no such commandment; and that it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and them to lay upon the Gentiles no greater burden than these necessary things, &c.] The Papists thus go out as from the Apostles, pretending an Apostolical Tradition, and impose upon the whole Christian world a multitude of Ceremonies and Doctrines as necessary to salvation, which are not to be found in the holy Scripture. How shall we know whether these men indeed have any command or Tradition from the Apostles for any such course? Why 1. Let them shew their Commission, and the proof of their Traditions. 2. We fully disprove them from the Apostles owne words. It seems good to the Holy Ghost and the Apostles to lay on the Gentiles no greater burden then the necessary things here named; and by these they may be saved, and they that teach otherwise are pronounced by them subverters of souls, that had no

com.

command from them for what they did. But it seemeth good to the Pope and his faction to lay on the Gentile Churches unnecessary things, and multitudes of them, pretending a necessity of them, when they are none of the four that are here onely made necessary by the Apostles, nor are so made by any other word of Scripture; and some they impose on pain of damnation, which they will not pretend to be of necessity themselves. By proportion therefore we may hence judge, that the Papists are meer false pretenders to Apostolical Tradition, and subverters of souls, and that the Protestants may be saved for all their presumptuous sentence to the contrary.

The Gospel which *Paul* preached to the *Corinthians*, and which they received, was such as would save them, if they kept it in memory, viz. that Christ dyed for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, &c. as *Paul* witnesseth, *1 Cor.* 15. 1, 2, 3, 4. And the *Corinthians* by the beliefe of this Doctrine, were a Church of God and sanctified, *1 Cor.* 1. 1, 2. But the Protestants believe all that the *Corinthians* received to make them such a Church and sanctified and saved; Therefore the Protestants are so too.

John wrote his Gospel that men might believe, and believing might have life, *Joh.* 20. 30, 31. Therefore he that believeth that Gospel shall have life: but the Protestants believe all that Gospel; therefore they shall have life (supposing it to be a true faith that worketh by love.) The Jews that heard *Peters* Sermon, *Act.* 2. were converted and added to the Church (even three thousand souls) and put into a

state of Justification by Believing that Sermon, *vers.* 37, 38, 41, 46, 47. But the Protestants believe all that *Peter* preached in that Sermon : therefore they also are of the Church and justified.

And least the Accusing Devil or Papists, should trouble the peace of any of his people, Christ hath protested it with his own mouth, *Joh. 5: 24* [*Verily, Verily I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believed on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death to life*] Me thinks this should make any Believer tremble at the thoughts of condemning those that Christ hath protested shall not be condemned.

Christ hath promised that all those that receive his words, and in whom his words abide, shall be beloved of the Father and have everlasting life, and be heard in what they aske, *Joh. 14. 23. & 15. 7.* Doubtless that which Christ himself preached was the true Gospel, and so far sufficient that whoever believeth it shall be saved. Otherwise Christ could not have converted any soul, so far as to have brought them into a state of Salvation by his Doctrine : and then *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles were not true Christians by the belief of the Doctrine of Christ, But if the Doctrine which Christ preached be sufficient to make true Christians and Church-members of those that receive it, then the Protestants are such : For, they believe every word that the Evangelists record of the Doctrine of Christ. And if the Papists say that there is more of his Doctrine necessary to salvation, which the Evangelists did not record in Scripture, 1. We call for their proof of it, and 2. We know that the Evangelists did purposely write the
four

four Gospels or Histories of Christ, of purpose to acquaint the world with his Nature, Birth, Life, doctrine Death and Resurrection, &c. *Luke* professeth that he wrote his Gospel upon perfect understanding of all things from the very first, which conteyneth a Declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they were delivered by them that from the beginning were eyeWitnesses and Ministers of the Word, *Luk.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. And he tells us *Act.* 1. 1, 2. that he wrote his Gospel of all things that Jesus began both to do and teach, untill the day in which he was taken up. It would therefore have been an exceeding blemish to the Evangelists that wrote of set purpose both the History of Christs Life and Doctrine, if they had left out any part of it that was of necessity to salvation. Protestants therefore that believe all the Gospel do believe so much as may bring them safely to salvation. If Christ himself be not a sufficient Teacher, nor the Gospel it self a sufficient Doctrine of Life, Then whither shall we go to seek it? Then *Peter* himself was not the Rock, nor a true Christian by Christs Teaching: And then the Pope could not derive that from *Peter* which he had not. But *Peter* himself thought and taught otherwise. He saith [*Lord whether shall we go? we know that thou hast the words of Eternal Life*] For my part I will take *Peters* counsel, and go to Christ for the words of Eternal Life, which are purposely recorded by four Evangelists in the Gospel: Let who will go to the Pope for another Gospel, to supply the supposed defects of this, for I will not.

In *Act.* 22. & 26. and other places *Paul* preacheth so much of the Gospel, as might have made true

Believers, and all that, the Protestants receive.

The Church of *Rome* when *Paul* wrote his Epistle to them, were a true Church, *Rom.* 1. 7. and all the Doctrine that *Paul* writeth to them we do believe.

Paul telleth the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Act.* 20. 27. that he had not shunned to declare to them the whole counsel of God : and this is summed up in [*Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ*] *vers.* 21. And whatsoever *Paul* hath written to these *Ephesians* or any other Churches or persons, we believe.

But what should we talk any more with such an arrogant unreasonable sort of men, that dare maintaine that the belief of all the Holy Scripture is not large enough to salvation. Atheists and Infidels say of the Scripture, that it is too big to be all true : And Papists say that it is not big enough to bring a man to heaven that believeth and obeyeth it. Shall the Holy Ghost endite a Volume as big as the Bible, and when he hath done shall any pretending to be Christians, perswade the world that he that believeth all this, shall be damned if he believe not the closet-Traditions which the *Romane* Bishop pretendeth to be the keeper of?

Nay see the strange contradictions of this giddy faction ! They lock up this Scripture it self from the common people in an unknown tongue : They damne the translating of it as the root of all Heresies, and burn men to ashes for using the Bible; when they cannot keep it unknown any longer, they translate it themselves as far as they can to their own advantage, and put it forth with their perverting Annotations; and yet when they have all done, they condemne any
that

that read it without a special licence from their Ordinary : which in *England* and *France* they sometime grant to avoid suspicions ; but in *Spain*, *Italy*, &c. too few if any at all. And when they have written voluminously to prove that the Scriptures are not necessary to the people for salvation, and that Ignorance is the mother of devotion, they come back again, and dispute against the Protestants, that the whole Scripture is not sufficient to salvation, and he that believes but the Scriptures is not in a safe way to salvation. It seems then that the Popes Canons are more necessary then the Scripture : For a man may be saved without the knowledge of Scripture, but not without the knowledge of the Canons of the Pope : Yes, that he may too : if some of them mistake not, if they will but implicitly believe that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholike Church, and that the Pope is the infallible soveraign of the Christian world, and believe some Articles of the Creed upon his credit, he may be saved without either Scripture or Canons, so he be but ready to believe and obey whatever shall be offered to him by the Pope for the time to come.

Moreover Christ and his Apostles do frequently promise Remission and salvation to all that truly Repent, that love God in Christ, that mortifie the flesh, &c. but all this do the Protestants, and their Religion teacheth them to do it. *Paul* concludeth that, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh but after the spirit*, Rom. 8. 11. But the Protestants are in Christ Jesus, and their Religion teacheth and engageth them so to walk : therefore there is no condemnation to them (that do so) and they may with
the

the same Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. Challenge all the Papists in the world. It is God that justifieth, who shall condemne us?

Paul telleth *Timothy* that the holy Scriptures are able to make him wise to salvation, *2 Tim.* 3. 15. therefore they may make us also wise to salvation. And he addeth, that [*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works,*] *vers.* 16, 17. It were endless to recite all that proveth the salvation of them that believe and obey the holy Scriptures. But this all true Protestants do. I shall therefore leave this taske, and next hear what the Papists can say to the contrary, and what they are able to produce to prove that we are not in a safe way to salvation.

Obj. 1. There is but one safe way to Heaven: The Protestant Religion is not that one way: Therefore not a safe way. The Minor is proved thus: That Religion which the Church hath owned from the Apostles dayes till now, is that one way: The Protestant Religion is not that which the Church hath so owned: therefore it is not that one Religion. The Minor is proved by parts: 1. As to Doctrine, 2. as to Discipline, 3. as to worship. 1. The Church ever since the Apostles dayes, hath maintained the Doctrines of, 1. Free-will to good or evil, 2. of Predestination upon foreseen faith, 3. of mans merits, 4. of Justification by Inherent Grace, 5. against the certain Perseverance of all the Justified, and consequently against their certainty of salvation. 6. Vow-

6. Vowed Chastity and Monastical Life. In Discipline the Church ever held, 1. The Popes Supremacy and Universal Jurisdiction; 2. The Government by Bishops over Presbyters: 3. Ordination by them, and not without them. 4. Pennance and Confession of sin. 3. In matter of Worship the Church hath still used, 1. Chrysme to the Baptized. 2. Imposition of hands in confirmation. 3. The sacrifice of the Altar. 4. The Cross. 5. Holy dayes. 6. Fasting dayes. All which the Protestants have cast off: Therefore they are not of the same Religion.

Ans. 1. To the Major Proposition of the main Argument, I answer. The word [*safe*] referreth to some Danger that we are safe from: The way may be called safe therefore, either in respect of sin or damnation: Also this way may be called [*one*] in respect of the Essentials of Religion, or else in respect of some inferior truths and duties, that are not of absolute necessity to salvation. And so I say that there is but one Religion as to the Essential and absolutely necessary points, in which a man can be safe from Damnation. And there is but one Religion as comprehending all the Integral parts, in which a man can be safe from sin: But yet that Religion which in the Essentials and Absolutely necessary points is but one, may yet consist with errors in lower and lesser things in the minds of those that hold it; and yet be a safe way to salvation, though not so safe as to freemen from all sin. And consequently there may be differences among true Christians that shall be saved, though there be nothing but perfect Harmony in the entire Doctrine

Doctrin of Christian Religion as delivered from Christ and his Spirit : Because no man holds that Doctrin entirely and perfectly without any error or ignorance , and therefore there will be much difference among those that shall be saved. To the Major of the Pro-syllogisme, I answer, Implicitely and in Generals the Church hath owned the perfect truth in all ages , because it hath Believed that all that God saith is true, and that the Scripture is his word : But explicitely and particularly the Church hath not held all the truth of Religion, in any one age since the Apostles. For every man on earth hath been Ignorant , and the most knowing men erroneous in some things : seeing we are all imperfect, and here know but in part. And so one particular Church might erre in one thing, and another in another thing, as the differences about Easter, Rebaptizing, the Millennium, Infants Communicating, &c. shew they did. And of the same Church one Member might erre in one thing and another in another thing : it being as certain that no two men on the earth are in all things of the same minde , as that none on earth are perfect in knowledge. To the Minor I answer, that the Religion called Protestant is the same in all points absolutely necessary to salvation which the Church hath still owned : And in other inferior points, the Churches having not been all or alwayes of one minde , some ages were more pure , and others more corrupt : The Protestant Religion is neerer to that of the purer times then the Papists is : It is the same in the Essentials ; it is the neereſt it in the Integrals ; it is more remote from latter corruptions introduced in times more remote from the Apostolical purity.

To the particular instances of our differences from the former Churches, I answer particularly. 1. For Free will to God, if you mean a natural freedom, which is [the wills self-determining Power] so the Protestants maintain it as well as the Fathers. If you mean a moral freedom from ill-inclining habits, which is properly a right-disposition, so the Fathers maintained it not.

Obj. Let *Sculdetus in Medulla Patrum* and others of your own Writers be judge who still number this *inter navos Patrum*.

Ans. *Sculdetus* and *Calvin* and others might mistake the Fathers sense and think that they spoke of moral Freedom, when they spoke but of natural, which is inseparable from the will. And its like that they did so, seeing the Fathers maintained Original sin, which is that pravity of humane nature, which is clean contrary to moral Free-will. 2. And if the Fathers were for a Free-will in a moral-Ethical sense, so is one part of the Protestants as much as they were: And if they were in the right, so are those Protestants? If in the wrong then the other part of the Protestants are in this, in the right. 3. This is a point that men may differ in, as much as the Fathers did from us, and yet be in a safe way to salvation. 4. The Dominicans and the Jesuites differ about it as much as we and the Fathers; yea, they cannot yet agree, what natural free-will is. 2. For Predestination upon foreseen faith.

* 1. There is no Declaration of the Churches

seen unbelieve: and others being for Predestination (i. e. Election) upon foreseen faith.

* In this the Ancients differed among themselves *Austin* and his followers being for absolute Predestination and for Reprobation upon fore-

minde

minde in those times about it, but what is found in the writtings of particular Doctors. 2. We confess that men are Elected to Glory and Justification from guilt, upon foreseen faith: But we say withall that they are Elected to that faith; and that God did foresee it as a thing which he intended to give, and not as a thing which corrupted unregenerate nature would produce. 3. And we say also, that this is a point that men may differ in that yet are in a safe way to salvation.

3. As to the point of mans merits, we say; that the Fathers differed from us but in word and not indeed: It seemed good to them to call every moral aptitude or Ordination *ad Premium*, that is, the Rewardableness of our actions, by the name of merit; and every Rewardable work meritorious. We thinke it fittest to forbear this name. This Verbal difference makes not two distinct Religions.

4. As to the point of Justification, we confess that the Fathers commonly called that Justification which we now call Sanctification. And we our selves maintain that Sanctification doth consist in Inherent Graces. This difference therefore being but verbal, the Religion and the way to salvation is nevertheless the same.

* *Austin, Prosper Fulgentius, &c* fully maintain the Perseverance of all the Ele&, though not of all the Justified.

5. As for the points of * Perseverance and certainty of Salvation, and Virginitie or vowed Chastity, with the supposed merit thereof, and of a Monastical or Eremetical life; we think that most of the Churches since the first century, have departed from the Apostles Doctrine in these points;
and

and therefore we appeal to the Scripture. But yet we know that these are not points of absolute necessity to salvation ; so that whether those Churches, or we were mistaken, yet is our Religion the same, and both they, and we in a safe way to Heaven.

2. For matters of Government and Discipline we say 1. That we undertake to manifest it as cleare as the light, that the Popes Supreme Headship, and universal jurisdiction, is a novelty introduced above six hundred years after Christ. 2. For Diocesane Episcopacy and their ordination, some of the Reformed Churches do own it : But it is not a matter so necessary to Salvation, as that all men that will be saved must needs be of one minde in it. 3. We confess and maintain the necessity of true Penitence and such confession of sin as is necessary to manifest Penitence to the Church after a notorious scandal : and of confession to those that we have wronged : and of private confession to our Pastors, in case that we cannot have a through cure of our wounds, or comfort to our consciences without it. Lastly, as for the Ceremonies mentioned which the former Churches used, and as for the bare name of a Sacrifice and Altar (while they agreed with us in sence) we take them not to be matters of so great moment, as must make them and us of two Religions ; as if both were not in a safe way to salvation. The best men on earth may differ in as great a matter as one of these : and if they in a mistaken zeal shall depart from the Apostles, so that we cannot imitate both the Apostles and them, we had rather of the two leave them then the Apostles; yet holding with them still in the maine.

Obj. The Religion of Protestants differs from the Abassine and Greek Churches and all the world as well as the *Romane*, and therefore cannot be a safe way. *Ans.* 1. If that be not a safe way which differs from the Greeks, Abassines, &c. then the Papists way is much less safe then ours: for they do not onely differ from them, but un-Church them and condemne them to Hell, and so do not we. 2. We are of the same Religion with them: onely we have by Gods great mercy cast out of that one way some stones of offence, which they have not yet cast out.

Obj. 2. The true safe Religion hath had a visible Church professing it from Christs time till this day: But the Protestant Religion hath not had a visible Church, professing it to this day: therefore it is not the true safe Religion.

Ans. The Major I easily grant and disclaim the needless shift of them that would deny it. But the Minor I deny: If they call for the proof of that visible Church, and aske where it was before *Luther*, we say that it was wherever Christ had a Church: From Christs time till many hundred years after, even at *Rome* it self and many other places: and from Christs time to this day it hath been in *Ethiopia*, *Greece*, *Egypt*, *Mesopotamia*, and many other Countries, if not still among the *Romanists* themselves: for full proof of which, note, that it is from the

Essentials,

Essentials, and points of great necessity that we denominate our Religion; and every difference in lesser things doth not make a distinct Religion: else there were as many Religions in the world as men. Note also that the main difference between us and the Papists is, not that they deny the substance of our Religion directly, but that they superadde a great many of new Articles to the old Creed, and have made their Religion much larger then ours, many of their new Articles consequently subverting the Fundamentals which they profess. So that our Religion is, and still hath been among the Papists, and other Churches: and if they adde more to it, that makes it not cease in it self to be what it was. Our Religion is wholly contained in the Holy Scriptures, and that all the Churches have still allowed of: The Papists themselves confess it all to be the Word of God, which we appeal to as the onely Touch-stone and rule of our faith.

Obj. So you would make our Religion and yours to be all one. *Ans.* As the word Religion signifieth the Essentials of the Christian Faith, or the points of absolute necessity to Salvation, so our Religion is with you, and is owned or confessed by you: As it signifieth all those points that are *conceited* necessary to Salvation with the professors, so your Religion is not all, but part, with us: And as it comprehendeth also all those Integral parts, which a man may confessedly be saved without, so he do not wilfully reject them, so yours and ours do much differ. And that your Religion is not all with us is no loss to us; because the points of yours which we disown are both novel additions of your own brain, and also such as contradict the acknowledged verities.

D

Where,

Wherever then Christ had a Church that did believe all the Doctrine of the Scripture, and specially the Creed, the Lords Prayer, the Decalogue, the Doctrine of the new Covenant, Baptisme, the Lords Supper, and the Ministry, there was our Religion before *Luther*: If any added hay and stubble, if their work be burnt, and they suffer loss, yet our Religion among them is the same still.

Obj. But do not you make this Negative a part of your Religion; that nothing but Scripture is to be believed *sive divina*? and what Church was of that Opinion?

Ans. 1. We have oft at large shewed that many of the ancient Doctors of the Church have asserted the Scriptures sufficiency at large, and appealed to them as the full Revelation of Gods will concerning all things necessary to salvation, and the sufficient Rule to Judge of controversies. 2. If they did any of them think that the Church had a superadded Revelation by Tradition, in points of order, of no necessity to salvation; this doth not make them and us to be of two Religions, or wayes of Salvation, as long as they do not introduce any dangerous or destructive points under that pretence.

Obj. But the Church still held those things as necessary to Salvation which you deny. *Ans.* We deny that to be true: Some of the points in difference are novelties of your own, which the ancient Church did never hold: the rest are such as they never laid such a stress, as mens salvation upon.

To conclude, Let it be considered whether this Argument may not damne your selves which I turn against you Thus. The true safe Religion hath had a visible Church professing it from Christs time till

now:

now : But the Religion of the *Romanists* (as comprehending all points of their faith, or made by them to be necessary to salvation) hath not had any visible Church professing it of many hundred years after Christ : Therefore it is not the true Religion, nor a safe way to salvation, The Minor I shall undertake more seasonably to make good : And our Divines have done it already.

No doubt but common reason and justice requireth, that you that call to us so earnestly for a Catalogue of the Professors of our Religion in all Ages should be as much obliged your selves to give us a Catalogue of yours : yea and to give it first, because you are the first in pleading the necessity of it. Undertake this task therefore, and perform it well, and you shall carry the whole cause. Give us a Catalogue of any, besides impeached Hereticks, that did own your main points of Popery for many hundred years after Christ, and we will give you a full account of such as contradicted those conceits and believed as we do, and let both be compared together, and let the most satisfaction and the fullest evidence carry it. You make a meer empty noise among the vulgar, of Antiquity and Universality, and call for a proof of the perpetual or continued visibility of our Church, as if in this you had the advantage, and the ballance did turn on your side : When as (though we know that there is no such necessity of our proof in this as you pretend yet) we know your disadvantage here to be so great, that if you will but be perswaded to this way of tryal, it will be to the utter shame and confusion of your cause. Whats the matter else that you still appeal to the latter or present Church, and that is only to the *Romane*, and thats

onely to your selves? If we do but invite you to a tryal by Scripture, and the Fathers and Records of the three first ages, you presently scorn the motion and fall upon the Fathers with accusations, as if they had not understood or believed all that was necessary to salvation, or to the being of a Christian or a Church; for you say they did not meddle with these controversies; and so you call us down to the latter or present times, as having equal authority with the first: To which we say, 1. That the silence of the first times concerning these matters, if there were no more (as yet there is) is sufficient to prove that they were not then taken for any necessary points of faith. For, Though our Records of the second Age be very short, yet both they and much more those of the third and fourth Ages do containe such purposely undertaken, explications of the Christian faith, that we cannot imagine such a multitude of necessary points would have been omitted. 2. And though the Pastors of the present age have equal Authority in Ruling their Congregations, with those of the second, yet they cannot give us so sure an account what was the doctrine and practice of the former Ages, nor any way prove it to us but by producing such records.

The Papists themselves are so far from denying that the Ancient Fathers and Churches did hold the Positive part of our Religion, that they hold it themselves; For they themselves profess to believe every book of holy Scripture that we do: They say they believe the Creed called the Apostles, and the *Nice* and *Constantinopolitane* Creed, and that of *Athanasius*; and so do we (still taking the holy Scripture onely for our Rule) so that their own tongues

must

must confess the Antiquity, and Universality, and succession of our Religion: For this is ours.

But all that they have to object is this, That we can name no Churches or Fathers that held our *Negatives*. To which I say, 1. The *Negatives* (at least, for the most part of them, if not all) are the meer consequences of the Affirmatives and Positives, and implied or plainly included in them: For example, when our Religion saith [*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*] this includeth the Negative, [Thou shalt not worship or serve Saints, Angels or any other, save only by a service and honour due] *Mat. 4. 10.* subservient to the service and worship of God: and therefore that we give not Divine worship to the consecrated host, or the Virgin *Mary*, or to any other meer creature. Our Religion teacheth us [to do all things to edifying] *1 Cor. 14. 26.* This includeth the negatives [that we must not worship God in an unknown tongue or unedifying manner, bleating and bellowing out our prayers in hideous or ridiculous tones.] Our Religion maketh it the Ministerial Commission, to teach the Nations and Baptize, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* This includeth the Negative that women or lay men should not so teach (that is, as Commissioned officers) nor baptize: This affirmative [*Peter* was sent to Disciple Nations] *Mat. 28. 19.* includeth this Negative [*Peter* was not sent to be the fixed Bishop of *Rome*, and there to reside. This affirmative [The Apostles are the Foundation of the Church] includeth this negative [*Peter* alone is not the Foundation of the Church] This Affirmative [It is bread and wine which we take and eat and drink in the Eucharist] containeth or imply-

plyeth the Negative, that [It is not Christs flesh and blood, which the bread and wine is transubstantiated into] I might thus instance in many more: Our Ne-

gatives are contained or implied in our Affirmatives which you hold or confesse your selves.

So Dr. *White* confesseth that we cannot bring a Catalogue of those that in all ages have maintained our Negations of their corruptions, because the Corrupters were not then risen up; and how should we prove that the Church opposed an error before it was hatched.

2. I answer further, that we have expresse negatives also both in Scriptures and Fathers, in the main points of difference between us and the Papists. We have a plain [*Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, &c. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them, &c.*] We have a plaine [In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding that I might teach others also, then ten thousand words in a tongue] (unknown) 1 Cor. 14. 19. We have a plain [See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant] Rev. 22. 9. And so of the chief differences through the rest.

3. If we had but this one point proved, that [the holy Scripture is a sufficient Rule of Faith] it fully warranteth all our Negatives wherein we differ from the Papists. For, to Believe all that is in Scripture, and that this is sufficient, will surely warrant as to exclude their additions. And we have oft proved that the first ages did maintain the Scripture sufficiency. This one answer doth fully justifie us against this cavil of the Papists. The Ancient Church and Fathers believed the Scripture and the sufficiency of that Scripture as containing all points of faith: And so do we.

we. And so all Popish faith is excluded (Though we confess many Ceremonies and points of order were then admitted as from the Church.

4. Negatives became necessary to be expressly asserted by occasion of Heresies. And therefore who can wonder if many of them are never mentioned till those heresies did call them out. When there was no man so impudent as to say that [The Pope of *Rome* is the Universal Bishop and Governor of the whole Church] or that [God must be worshipped in an unknown tongue] or that [Images must be worshipped] who could expect that the Church should have occasion in words to express it as a part of their faith that [The Pope is not the universal Bishop; not infallible, &c.] and so of the rest? If Popery had risen sooner, it had sooner been contradicted.

5. There may be an hundred Negatives made necessary hereafter by heresies, which it is not necessary now to put into our Creed or confessions, because they are not yet sufficiently contained or implied in the contrary Affirmatives. If Hereticks arise that say that man hath seven souls; that the soul returns to be Gods Essence, and was so eternally; that there are fourteen Sacraments; that Infants must take Orders; with a hundred the like; then it might be necessary for us expressly to deny these; and shall they then tell us that our Religion is new and theirs old, because we cannot prove that any did before deny theirs? So what if we could not prove that any before had said [The Pope is not the Universal Governor?] that is because there was none so shameless for six hundred years as to say he was. Whose Religion then is proved new by this, ours or theirs?

But I shall say somewhat more to this anon in the

end.

D 4

Obj.

Obj. 3. That Religion which cannot be known as having no certain test to discern it by, can be no safe way to salvation: But such is the Reformed Religion, therefore, &c. The Minor is proved: If they have any such test, either 'it is Scripture, or some confessions of their own: But neither of these: therefore not Scripture: For that is appealed to by many Religions, and therefore can be no proper Test to discern one of them from the rest: Besides it knows not so much as the name of the *Reformed Protestant Religion*: Not any confession: for they have no one which they agree in, but one disclaimeth what another owneth: And they have none agreed on by a General Councel, or by all themselves.

Ans. 1. The Test of our Religion is the holy Scripture; This we profess joyntly to be the Rule of our faith and life: To this we still Appeal, If we misanderstand it in any point, we implicitly renounce all such errors; because we explicitly in general renounce all that is contrary to the Scripture. This may be the true Test of our Religion though others falsely pretend that theirs is more agreeable to it. Many things may be tryed by the same Touchstone, and weighed by the same ballance; whereof some may be currant, and others unsound, or light. May not the Law of the Land be the true Rule of our obedience to our Governors, though the Rebellious or disobedient should pretend to be Ruled by the same Laws.

2. They

2. They are not all distinct Religions which the Papists call so: Many appeal to the same Scriptures, who agree in the main concerning the sense, and disagree onely in some inferior things. These are not several Religions.

3. Our confessions do shew how we understand the Scripture; wherein we agree in the main, as the Harmony of Confessions testifieth, though in some lesser things we differ.

Obj. 4. They that have causelessly separated from all the Churches in the world are not of the true Religion nor in a safe way to Salvation: But so have the Protestants done: for they are divided both from *Romane Church*, the *Greeks*, *Abassines*, *Armenians*, and all: therefore they are not in a safe way.

Ans. Its one thing to withdraw from some corruption of a Church and another to withdraw from the Church. 1. We that are now living did not withdraw from *Rome* or any of the rest: for we were never among you or under you. 2. Our Fathers withdrew not from the Church as Christian or Catholic-like, but from the particular corruptions of the *Romane* faction, in Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship; rejecting their lately usurped Tyranny, by which they would have still obliged them to sin against God. As we are commanded to withdraw from each particular Brother that walketh disorderly, so must we from a particular Church when they will be so disordered, as to Tyrannize over the universal. 3. The Church of *Rome* rejected us by a causeless excommunication-

nication, who were not *de jure* under her power.
 4. We still profess our selves of the same Church with the *Greeks, Abassines, Arminians, Copries*, and all others on earth that hold the Scriptures, and that so hold the Anticent Creeds or fundamentals of Christianity; as that they do not evidently subvert it again by contradictory Errors: If they hold no Errors but what may consist with a true belief of the Fundamentals in the same persons (though by an unseen consequence they may contradict them) we separate not from that Church so as to disclaim it from being a true Church: And therefore its not true that we so separate from all the world: but as to the Local Personal Communion or presence, we dare not joyn with the truest Church in the least known sin: But in that respect we cannot be said to separate from the *Greeks or Abassines*, that we have no opportunity of Local Communion with. While all men are imperfect, one may see that Error which another seeth not: and to separate meerly from a sin of one man or a Church is not simply to separate from the man or Church.

Obj. 5. That Religion which hath no unity in it self or consistency, but is broken into many Sects, and still running further, is no safe way to salvation. But such is the Protestant Religion, therefore.

Ans. We deny the Minor. Our Religion is one, simply one, and most consistent, and having one sure standing Rule, not subject to changes as yours is; even the word of God himself. The same

same Rule that the first Churches had, and the same Test by which the Christian Religion was known of old, when the Belief of the Scripture, and particularly the Ancient Creeds, and the actual Communion with the true Church, was the test of a Catholike, the one in Doctrine, the other in Communion, as freeing him from Schismes. We believe all the same Articles, and we divide not from the Catholick Church. If any depart from Scriptures as to the sense in points absolutely necessary, they cease to be of our Religion. If any depart from it in lesser things, they may yet be of the same Religion with us; but so far we disown them, if we know it. Popery hath no, sure test, or means to prevent mutation. But we have in that we fix on the Immutable Rock. If Anabaptists, Separatists, or any erroneous persons live among us, so far as they hold those errors, so far they are none of us: And if any err, whom we dare not reject, we yet reject their errors, and take them for no part of our Religion. And if this Argument hold, it will much more condemne the Romanists, who have more diversity of opinions and wayes among them then the Protestants, as may in due place be shewed.

Obj. 6. That is not the true Religion nor a safe way to Heaven, which men can have no Infalible certainty of. But the Protestant Religion is such: For they all profess their Church to be fallible.

Ans. We must distinguish between a man that *May* be deceived, and a man that *Is* deceived: And
bc

between Infallibility in the Object, and in the Subject or Intellect. And between Infallibility in the absolutely necessary points, and in some Inferior smaller matters. And so I *Ans.* 1. The Rule of our Religion, *viz.* the word of God, is Infallible; yea the onely Infallible Rule of Religion: and therefore we have an Infallible, and the onely Infallible Religion. 2. The weakness of the Recipient must be differenced from the Religion which hath no such weakness. There is still the certainty and Infallibility of the Object; when the believer through his own weakness may be uncertain. 3. No man is *Falsus* actually deceived, while he believes that doctrine of our Religion, that is, the holy Scripture: And this we are certain of. 4. No Christian in *sensu composito*, nor no Church is fallible, or can err in the Fundamentals or points absolutely necessary. For if he do so, he ceaseth to be a Christian, and that to be a Church. 5. In *sensu diviso*, he that was a common believer, may Apostatize from the faith, and so may a particular Church: and therefore is fallible, but is not, as is said, Deceived, till it turn from the Infallible truth. 6. The best man or Church on earth doth know but in part, and therefore erreth in part, and therefore is fallible in part or in lower things. So that it is not the least proof of the fallibility of Scripture or the Reformed Religion, that men may Apostatize from it, or that they may stagger in Believing an Infallible Truth, or that we are fallible in lesser things. All true Believers are actually Infallibly persuaded of the Truth of Gods Word, and particularly of all things absolutely necessary.

Obj. 7. That Religion is not true nor a safe way to heaven which wanteth many Articles of faith; But the Protestant Religion wanteth many Articles of faith : Therefore.

Ans. 1. We must distinguish of our Religion, as it is in the Professed Rule, and as it is Impressed in the mindes of men : In the former respect, we say that our Religion wanteth no Article of faith : for Gods perfect Word is our Religion : But in the minds of men Religion is more or less imperfect according to the strength or weakness of mens faith. 2. We must distinguish between true Articles of Faith, and false ones made by the Church of *Rome*, We are without the latter (but want them not) but we expect that they who call them Articles of faith, do prove them so.

Obj. 8. Your Religion is unsafe by your own Testimony : You condemne one another : the *Lutheran* condemneth the *Calvinist* as Blasphemous, impious, and damnable : the *Calvinists* condemn the *Lutherans* : the *Anabaptists* both : and every sect is condemned by others : Therefore.

Ans. 1. The Churches confessions pass no such condemnation ; nor any moderate sober men. 2. If two children fall out, & call one another Bastard, they are never the more Bastards for that, nor will the father

father therefore call them so ; else what will become of your Jesuites and Dominicans.

Obj. 9. The very name of *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Protestants*, do plainly express a Sect or party, different from the Name [*Catholike*] which denoteth the true Church which only holds the true Religion : And the very name [*Reformed*] is novel, and no proper title of the Catholike Church, but onely a cloak for your Schisme, which discloseth the novelty of your Church and way.

Answ. 1. And of how much better signification think you, is the name [*Papist*] or [*Romanist*] ? You call your selves Catholikes, and we call our selves Catholikes : You scornfully call us *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists* which are names that we disclaime, and then argue from your own imposed names. Would you have us do so by you ? And as for the names of *Protestants*, and *Reformed*, we use them not to express the Essential nature of our Religion, but the Accidental Removal of your Corruptions. So that though Scripture or Antiquity take not of [*A Protestant, or Reformed Religion*] by name, yet it commendeth to us that same Religion, which we now call [*Protestant, or Reformed*] but then it could not so be called, because you had not then hatched your corruptions and deformities, which are presupposed to our Reformation. The man that fell among thieves, when his wounds were healed, was a [*Cured man*] whereas before he was not a cured man, because not a wounded man : And yet he

he was the same man as before; and the Theeves that wounded him would have made but a foolish plea, if they would have dispossessed him of his Inheritance on pretence that he is not the same man, and have proved him not the same, because he hath not the same name, it being not a Cured man that owned that inheritance before.

Obj. 10. Where the Catholike Church is, there the Catholike Religion is, and no where else: But the Catholike Church is not with you, but with us. For, you found us in Possession of the name and thing and then departed from us as Hereticks in former ages did from the Church: Therefore it is not you but we that have the true Catholike Religion, which is the onely safe way to salvation.

Answ. 1. The Church must be known to be true and Catholike by the Religion which it owneth, and not the Religion by the Church. You begin at the wrong end: As if I would prove such a thing to be a Vertue because it is in such a man, as I esteem, when I should rather prove him to be honest and Virtuous, because that which is first, proved honesty, & Vertue dwelleth in him. 2. Did we not find the *Greek*, *Ethiopian* and other Churches in possession of the name of the Catholike Church as well as you? Yet you would dispossess them. 3. We found you in Possession of *All* in your own account: and all is yours if your selves must be Judges. But in the account of the *Greek*, *Abassine* and other Churches we found you in Possession but of the name of [A Church] and not [The

[The Church] a Part of the Church Catholike, and not the whole; a Corrupt part and not the Head, or the Purest part. 4. We departed not from you as a Church, much less as the Catholike Church, but as corrupted: Nor do we yet deny you to be a Church, but to be a sound Church or the Catholike Church.

Concerning this and the former Queries, especially [when our Church was in all Ages before *Luther*] we shall clear our selves by giving the true state of the case, which will Justifie it self.

Christ came to be the Physician of diseased souls: In his Gospel he proclaimeth his office, and calls them to himself for cure, and prescribeth them the means: But he takes the time of this life for the accomplishing it, and cureth no man perfectly till death. His Church therefore is as an Hospital or a City so infected, that there is not one in it that is perfectly sound: One of the deepest radical diseases is Pride, which corrupted the blood even of the Apostles themselves. So far that it broke out into such an Itch, that they could not forbear contending who should be the greatest even in the presence of Christ himself. He derides the controversie, telling them [with you it shall not be so, but he that will be great shall be the servant of all.] This disease of Pride was still alive in part, even wherever it was mortified, so that such like desires of superiority were excited by it also in the Apostles successors, the Pastors of the Church in following ages. But it came but to a troublesome Itch till *Constantines* time: For the nailes of Persecution did so claw it, that the corrupt blood was let out and the Itch was frequently abated by the smart: But when *Constantine* lifted
up

up the Bishops with honors, renew, and the ad-
 junction of secular power to their wills or censures,
 then the itch turned to a plain Scab, the corrupt
 blood continuing, and the scarifying scratches of
 persecution ceasing. But this overspread not the
 whole body, the Catholike Church much less all a-
 like: but it seized mainly upon the Clergy who
 should have been examples of humility and self-de-
 nial to the rest: And principally on the Clergy
 of the *Romane* Empire, and some others that they
 infected: But on none so much as the Bishop of
Rome, and his Clergy. For *Rome* being the Imper-
 rial seat, and drawing to it the glory, riches, and
 observance of the world, the Bishop of that place
 must needs be accordingly magnified and observed;
 especially because that he being at the Emperors ear
 might have pleased or displeased almost any
 Prince or Prelate in the Empire. At last by translation
 of much of the Glory to *Constantinople*, the heat of
 the disease was conveyed thither too, so that *John* of
Constantinople and *Gregory* of *Rome*, contended a-
 bout the Universal Supremacy: *John* laid the first
 claime to it, because he was Bishop of the Imperial
 seat. *Gregory* laies no claim to it himself, but con-
 tradicteth *Johns*, pronouncing it a note of Antichrist
 to claim the title of Universal Bishop, little think-
 ing that his own successors would have claimed it so
 soon. At last *Phocas* being helped by the *Romane*
 Bishop to possess the throne of his murdered Prince,
 doth help the Pope to the Title of Universal Bishop,
 and the glory and strength of *Constantinople* abating,
Rome did the more easily hold what they had got.
 By this time the Scab was turned to a Leprosie, which
 drew on many other concomitant diseases as its sym-
 ptoms:

ptuous: The rest of the Church was some of it infected with some of the foresaid Scab, some more and some less, and some of them still were onely troubled with the old itch, though none perfectly sound, nor was that to be expected; much of the Western parts comply with their Leprous Patriarch, and submit to him while he calls himself Universal Bishop and Head of the Catholike Church, some consent, some say nothing though they dissent, and indeed the power was got into his hand, so that for fear of persecution few durst contradict, and specially when they saw no likelihood of doing good: Yet some in all Ages even under his nose, did signifie their dislike and offer some help to the cure. At last in *Luthers* dayes whole Countries do withdraw from the *Romane* Leprosie (as thousands called *Albigenses, Waldenses, &c.* had done before them) and so free themselves from the infection, and get off the very scab, and make fair attempts for the Cure of the very itch. Now what doth the *Romane* Clergy, but cry out after us as Hereticks and Schismaticks, and aske us [where was our Church before *Luther*?] and who were of our Religion till then? We answer them that if they have the Leprosie, and the times before them had (in most parts) the scab, and the former times the itch, cannot we prove that we are *Men* as well as they, unless we prove that we have the Leprosie, Scab, or Itch as they had? Are these Essential or Integral parts of a man? As humane nature is still with a Leper; but Leprous; and still with him that hath the Scab, but scabbed: so our Religion and Church was at *Rome* and still is, but Leprous since the Usurpation before mentioned: It was before that at *Rome*, but sorely scabbed: It was before that

at *Rome* troubled with the itch : It is still in *Greece* ,
Abassia , and other parts , but somewhat scabbed :
 It is in millions of the people free from that scab ;
 who in all Ages disliked the Clergies usurpations :
 though we cannot expect to hear this from them in a
 General Council , where they are not to be . But
 we take the people to be a true part of the Church .
 We have separated from you as from Lepers , not
 as from the Dead . We bury not your title of a
 Church or Christians , so you will adde [Leprous]
 And a Leprosie proves most commonly a killing dis-
 ease . We have reason to secure our selves from
 your infection , though our love to you were never
 so dear .

So that here's the quarrel ; and here's our defence .
 If all Christs Hospital in the Western part of the
 world , have much increased the disease that he would
 have cured them of ; it doth not follow that any man
 that is cured of their Leprosie , ceaseth presently to
 be a man , that he that is reformed of those vices ,
 ceaseth to be a member of the Catholike Church :
 Or that such Reformed Churches are new things that
 were not before : The Reformation may be new as
 to the latter Ages since corruption prevailed , but
 the Religion or Church-state is not new . Its a sad case
 with the Church when its corruptions are come to be
 accounted of its essence , so that he that will not re-
 taine the corruptions , must not be accounted to be a
 Christian or a Catholike at least , and he that will be
 cured must be accounted to be killed ; The Church
 was a Church before it cateht the *Romish* Scab or Le-
 prosie , and therefore is a Church where that is cu-
 red ; and I think far better without it , then with
 it .

By all this therefore it evidently appeareth that the Papists do most vainly charge us with novelty and

How far we account the Church of Rome a true Church, and yet the Papacy no true Church. See *Jubius* in his exact book de Ecclesiâ Cant. Bellarm. oper. Vol. 2. col. 1019. And the judgement of several of our Divines by Bishop Hall in his Defence against Burton.

call for a Catalogue of the professors of our Religion, when the novelty is theirs, and themselves do yet profess our Religion, though to it they have added their corrupting Leprosie. Though we cannot under take to prove that the

Church was perfect (nor never will be, till it come to heaven) yet we have oft proved that it was many Ages without their Popery, and are ready to undertake the further proof: Of which the next Disputation shall give you a taste.

There is a Railing Pamphlet extant, called [*A brief confutation of certain absurd, heretical and damnable doctrines, delivered by Master James Usher in a Sermon preached before King James at Wansted, Jun. 20. 1624.*] The Author calls himself *Paulus Veridicus*: Its printed at *St Omers*, 1627. Because I take the same way against the Romanists as this Reverend Bishop of *Armagh* taketh, and hath led me in that Sermon, I think my self the more obliged to consider of what is said against it.

The first onset of this M^r *Maledicus*, pag. 9. 10, 11. Is against our assertion that we are of the same Religion, and Church as the *Grecians, Egyptians, Christians, Ethiopians, &c.* and that all these are not to be damned as Hereticks and unchurched, because they

are

are not subjects of the Pope. To this 1. He confesseth that even the *Greeks* themselves are not subject to the Pope; and that [they soon departed from the (seeming) union made in the Council of *Florence*, about the year 1439.] 2. He confesseth that their doctrine about the Procession of the Holy Ghost *a patre per filium* and not *a patre filioque*, was such, that [when they had explicated it they were found to believe very Orthodoxly and Catholically in the same matter, and for such were admitted.] 3. He affirmeth that [he findeth not that in any substantial point they do dissent from the *Romane Catholike Church*, excepting the matter of Primacy.]

Let us first observe the consequences of this much.

1. From hence it followeth that the *Greek Churches* are guilty of no Heresie, but non-subjection to the Pope of *Rome*. 2. And that therefore indeed they are no Hereticks. 3. And therefore it is not of necessity to the being of a Church or Catholike Christian to be subject to the Pope: And that the Pope or *Romane Church* is not to enter the definition of the Catholike Church: for as the *Greeks* may be Catholikes without subjection to *Rome*, so may others. 4. And therefore they are no General Councils where all those Churches are absent, as at *Trent*, *Constance*, &c. And that its a false excuse of *Bellarmino* and the rest, to say that the *Greeks* and the rest are Hereticks or Schismaticks. 5. And therefore it declareth to all the world, both that the Popish designe and Religion is carnal and selfish, to exalt themselves above the whole Church of God, and also that they are more then barbarously tyrannical and censorious, and most extreemly schismatical, that will presume to cut off from Christ and

the Church, the greatest part of the Christians in the world, even those that themselves confess to be in all other things Orthodoxe, and that meerly because *they will not be the Popes subjects. I now proceed to the next.

The substance of his Answer consisteth of two gross untruths in a publike matter of fact, wherein many millions of men are able at the first hearing to prove him a bold false witness, making falshood the prop of his ill cause. The first untruth which he layeth down, is, that the *Grecians* do claim that supremacy to their own Patriarke of *Constantinople*, which they deny the Pope: and therefore if it be bad, it is as bad in them as the Papists, and so they are no Protestants. To which I say, it is not true: whatever any private or particular man may say, its well known that its not true of their Church in common, nor found in any of their Church confessions; but utterly and ordinarily disclaimed by them. Though *John* of *Constantinople* did claim the title of Universal Bishop because of the Emperors residence there, yet did he not get it, much less to be the Universal Governor, and yet much less is it now claimed when the Christian Empire is removed. To be *Episcopus prima sedis* is as much as is desired by the Patriarch himself; which yet he is content to leave, and take the second place, though neither of them concerneth an Universal Episcopacy.

Can they read such books as

* You may see it in
Nils * Archbishop of *Thes-*
Mich Goldastus de Mon.
arch. pag. 30. Tom. 1.

Salonica de primatu Papa
Parham, and many other of
the *Greeks*, and yet believe
themselves in these fictions? Why do we read or
hear

hear nothing from the Patriarche of *Constantinople* inviting and perswading us all to submit to his Government, as we and all the Christian world almost have been solicited by the Popes Emissaries to submit our selves to him? A short Reply may serve to such immodest false assertions as this nicknamed *Veridicus* maketh the chiefest part of his confutation.

The second untruth which constituteth this part of his answer, is, that [*The Grecians, Moscovites, and Egyptians do in one only point dissent from Rome, and in no point at all agree with the Protestants in quantum such, and dissent from their Catholike Church.*]

This one great falshood containeth two not small ones in it, and each of those two contain abundance more,

1. That all these Churches differ from you in no one point but the Popes supreamacy is a falshood beyond all modesty. For besides the supremacy they believe not your pretended Infallibility, nor do they pretend to the like of their own: They believe not your Purgatory: they own not your pardons for easing the pains of Purgatory, nor prayers for the dead to that end; nor the application of the treasury of the Saints Merits to that end, or for satisfaction to the Justice of God. They own not your Transubstantiation: They have the Scripture in their known languages: They worship God in their Liturgies in their known languages, the *Moscovites* in the *Moscovian* tongue, the *Georgians* in the *Iberick*; the *Arabians* in the *Arabick*; and so the *Carmanians*, *Slavonians*, *Greeks* in theirs: They administer the Eucharist in both kinds, and detest your Sacri-

legious withholding of the cup : They reject your
 confirmation : so do they your extreme Unction ?
 They admit Priests to live with their wives which
 were married before ordination : They reject the
 Religious use of graven Images or Statues : They
 teach that the holy Scriptures are a sufficient and per-
 fect rule of faith: they believe that they should not be
 lockt up from the people : They maintain that God is
 to be worshiped in understanding , and they abhor
 your praying by Beads and tale : They think not to
 wash away sin or drive away the devil by holy water:
 They take not Traditions to be one part of Gods
 Word, necessary to supply the defects of Scripture ;
 but take them and Church customes and constituti-
 ons to be onely for matters of order and determina-
 tion of such circumstances as it belonged not to the
 perfection of Gods Laws, to determine, but were to
 be left to the wisdom of Governors ; the Scriptures
 containing sufficient for salvation : They believe with
 the Protestants that Justification is not by the Merit
 of works : And that it is impossible for us properly
 to Merit *ex condigno* the least mercy , much less the
 Kingdom of Heaven at the hands of God : They have
 but one order of Monkes, *viz.* of *S^t Basil*, and those
 not such as the Papiists, that live a private, unprofit-
 able, droanish life ; but their Monasteries are as Col-
 ledges to fit them for the service of God in the
 Church, and thence they oft proceed to be Priests and
 Prelates : They take your Pope to be condemnable
 for his pride, cruelty and presumption : his pride for
 pretending to an universal jurisdiction, and usurping a
 power to depose Princes and dispose of their Crowns:
 his cruelty in persecuting other Christians for their
 differing judgements : and his presumption in grant-
 ing

ing pardons and deliverances from Purgatory. In a word they take the Papists for Schismaticks and accordingly condemne them with a solemne condemnation. The *Muscovites* and *Russians* admit not Priests or Deacons to Ordination unless they be marryed: and they refuse to communicate with the *Romane* Church. The Egyptian Christians allow not of Baptisme in any necessity whatsoever but onely by the Priest and in the Church, and administer the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds: they give not the Lords Supper or extream unction to the sick. They deny Purgatory and prayer for the dead: They marry in the second degree of consanguinity without dispensations: They elevate not the host: They reject all the general Councils after that of *Ephesus*: They repute the Papists to be Hereticks, and avoid their communion no less then of the Jews: Most of these also is common to the *Abassines*, who also admit Marriages of Priests and Bishops, and eat flesh on Fridayes, communicate standing in both kinds.

Are all these nothing? What, no *one difference*, with this Popish *Veridicum*? I will not desire him to take my word for all this, because I will not take his for the contrary, nor will I turn him to any Protestant for satisfaction, unless he will better use that one which himself citeth (*Sands* Relation of the *West. Relig.* or *Europe Specul.* p. 234. &c.) But I may with reason intreat him to believe his own brethren the Papists, and the *Greeks* themselves: And in some of them he may see many more differences then I have here named: For example in their *Possevin. de Rebus Moscov.* at large. See also *Concil. Florent. Sess. 18.* *Jerem.*
Patri-

Patriarch. Const. in Resp. 1. ad Germ. Zonar. Annal. Tom. 3. in Imper. Leo. Nilus de Primat. Papa. Barlam de Primatu Pape. sigebert in Chron. ad ann. 1054. Leo & Epist. ad Episcop. Constant. Jacob. a Vitriaco histor. Orient. Sigism. de Rebus Muscov. Guagn. descript. Muscov. Sacram. de Errorib. Ruthen. Boleri. Relat. Thom. a Jes. Conver. Gent. Guiliel. de Rubri. Itiner. Tartar. Oforius de Reb. Emanuel. Saligniac. Itiner. Alphons. a Castro contr. Hares. Damian a Goef. Prateol. de Haresib. Alvarez histor. Ethiop. (which yet have much falshood) Guid. summ. de Haresib. Burchardus Descript. terr. Sanct.

If our confuter cannot have leisure to read all these, let him onely read *Thom. a Jes. & Possevin. de reb. Moscov. & Apparnt. Sacra.* and see to his shame what his own friends say against his falshoods.

And that all these Christians are as considerable as all the Papists in the world, far over matching them for number, is apparent: Much more when we adde to the *Grecians* and *Moscovites*, and *Copti's*, all the *Syrians*, the *Georgians*, the *Indians* of *Saint Thomas* the *Abassines*, the *Nestorians*, the *Jacobits*, the *Armenians*, and the *Maronites*, and to them as *Protestants*, where then is the *Papists* *Universality*, and how few are they comparatively, and how plainly do they play the *Donatists* (but that it is on a far worse ground?)

The *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* alone hath under him in *Asia* (as *Brierwood* noteth) the *Christians* of *Natolia* (excepting *Armenia* the less and *Cilicia*) of *Circassia*, of *Mengrelia*, and of *Russia*: And in *Europe* also the *Christians* of *Greece*, *Macedon*, *Epirus*,
Thrace,

Thrace, Bulgaria, Rascia, Sextia, Bosnia, Walachia, Moldavia, Podolia, and Muscovia. (till lately) together with all the Islands of the *Ægean Sea*, and others about *Greece*, as far as *Corfu*, with much more.

And as is noted in *Curopolat. de Offic. Palasf. Constant. & Offic. Mag. Eccl.* he hath under him, The Archbishop of *Cæsarea in Cappadocia*; 2. *Ephesus*, 3. *Heraclea*, 4. *Ancyra*, 5. *Cizicum*, 6. *Sardis*, 7. *Nicomedia*, 8. *Nice*, 9. *Calcedon*, 10. *Mitylene*, 11. *Thessalonica*, 12. *Laodicea*, 13. *Synada*, 14. *Iconium*, 15. *Corinth*, 16. *Athens*, 17. *Patra*, 18. *Trapezuntium*, 19. *Larissa*, 20. *Naupactus*, 21. *Adrianopolis*. These are all Archbishops, and have many Bishops under them, viz. Of *Muscovy* 17. of *Larissa* 13. of *Athens* 11. of *Corinth* 10. of *Tessalonica* 9. &c.

And if these be under the Patriarch of *Constantinople* alone, how great a number are all the rest in the great Empire of the *Abassines*, and elsewhere through the rest of the Christian world?

I do not mention all these to intimate either that multitudes prove them or any to have the best cause, if we were in all things of their mindes, or as if I preferred them for Arts and Civil Policy to the *Romanes*, but to shew both the baniousness of the Popish Schisme that would unchurch so many, and the cruelty of their censures that would damne so many, and the Impudency of their pretence of Universality, and their vaine boasting of [All the Church] when they are so small a part of the Church, and more bad then small.

But we have been too long on this: let us come to the

the confuters next untruth; and that is [That the *Grecians, &c.* do in no one point agree with Protestants as such] what hath been said doth sufficiently shame that fiction.

But he instanceth in our differences: And 1. he saith [*The Grecians hold one supreme head of the whole Church under Christ*] Repl. An immodest fiction to uphold a cause thats like it.

2. He saith [*The Grecians hold the Real presence of our Saviours body and blood in the Eucharist*] Repl. not Transubstantiation; which they deny: The But Protestants do hold some kind of Reall presence.

3. He saith [*The Grecians defend the necessity of Baptisme to salvation, and that Original sin is remitted thereby*] Repl. And the Protestants hold it necessary *necessitate precepti*, and as an ordinary means where it can be had: And neither the *Greeks* nor all your own dare damne all Infants that dye before Baptisme, when it could not be had; but you say that the *Votum* may serve turne. And also Protestants hold that if the Infants be within the Covenant, as it pardoneth their Original sin primarily, so Baptisme pardoneth it by way of obfignation and solemne conveyance: But what is all this to your error that Original sin is not onely remitted, but quite extinct or done away out of our natures by Baptisme; so that the new baptized Infant, is perfectly without any Radical sin, as well as without the Guilt of it?

4. He saith [*They say that works do justifie with faith: You not*] Repl. They say that we are not justified by the Merit of Works, but by the alone Merit of Christ; and so do we. We deny not in every
sense

sence that [we are Justified by Works, and not by faith onely] for in *James* his sence we maintain it; else we should deny the Scripture: The question is not therefore absolutely, whether we are Justified by Works? but, In what sence we are, and in what not? We say that Christ is the onely Satisfier of Gods Justice and Meriter of Righteousness; and that Faith is the onely Receiving Condition; and that the Works of the Law that *Paul* excludeth have no hand in it; and that the Works of Grace which *James* takes in, are but conditions without which our Justification (begun without them) shall not be continued, and of our finall Absolution or Justification in Judgement; and so are but a Particular, and not an Universall or Legall Righteousnesse. (Of which I have given a full account in my Confession.)

5. He saith [*They maintain Freewill, even in the best actions. You not*] Repl. Freewill is either 1. Natural; which is but its self-determining power, with spontaneity; and this we deny not (For who denyeth man to be man, and to have the *Facultatem Volendi*?) Or it is, 2. Moral, and that is 1. Political, when a Governor gives the subject leave to do a thing; and so we maintain that God giveth our Wills Freedom to all good, and to no evil: Or 2. Ethical, which is nothing but the right inclination and Habits of the will with the absence of the contrary Habits: And so we say that, the better men are, the Freer, that is, the better are their Wills: And the unconverted have not this Freewill: nor the converted in perfection till they come to Glory: For the Freedom

dom is the Goodness. And seeing the Will so far Free Ethically as it is Good, Vertuous or Holy, the Question then is, Whether every mans Will be Good and Holy? which I am conceited you will not dare to affirme. A covetous man, a drunkard, an ungodly man, is as much or more denominated such, from the habite as from the act: he is most vicious that is Habitually so: To say therefore that such a mans Will is Free in this Ethical sence is to say that he is habitually no covetous man, no drunkard, no ungodly man no sinner: which being contrary to unquestionable experience, me thinks should be easily deserted. If you know of any thing else called Freewill besides these three before mentioned, we should be glad to know it too. The natural Essential Freedom, viz. A spontaneous self-determining power, we all confess: The Political Freedom, yea and obligation none denyeth: The Ethical Freedom, that is, Vertuous or holy Inclinations in wicked men, you will deny your selves; where then is the difference between us and either the *Greeks* or you.

Why you'l say, perhaps, that its here, That we deny the will to have that *Indifferency* which you affirme, as to opposite objects. But we are loath to fight with you in the Dark. Do you mean by *Indifferency* an Indifferency of Natural Power, or an indifferency of inclination or Habite? The first we do not deny: The will is a natural faculty that hath naturally no determination to One, where many means are propounded, but is undetermined, and hath a natural Power to determine it self to either: But yet you know the Wills Natural Power is exercised according to inclining Objects and Habits: And
you

you cannot expect that men who are Habitually inclined earthwards, should Will Heavenly things and renounce earthly things, meerly because they have a natural Power of choosing: for they want that inclination, which is called commonly the Moral Power: And I should suppose that in regard of this Moral Power, you will not affirm your selves that he hath *indifferentiam ad oppositum*? To say that a mans Will is indifferently inclined to Good and to Evil, is to say that the man is habitually neither good nor bad, unless as privation of due inclinations denominated him bad. I say the more of this, Dr. J. T. because I finde others of your party, and some that seem to disown both you and us (as a late Treatise of Repentance among others can witness) to harp so much on this string, and confusedly talke of Freewill before they tell us what they mean, and to perswade the world that we teach that God hath laid such a natural necessity on man to sin as he hath to eat and drink and sleep, and that God might as well damne men for being hungry or sleepy, as for being sinful in our sence! As if there were no more faultiness in a vicious disposition of the Will it selfe, then in a necessary natural inclination or Appetite of those faculties which were never made to rule themselves, but to be moderated by the Will of Reason. It may be these men will either deny the truth of the words of the Holy Ghost, that *They that are accustomed to do evil cannot learn to do well no more then a Leopard can change his spots, or a Blackamore his skin*; or else they will think such men excusable because they are so strongly enclined to evil; and so if a man habituated to Lust shall vitiate their wives, or a man habituated to malice shall beat them often, or maim them, or kill their

their friends, they may think that he deserveth not punishment but pity, because he is so bad that he could not (morally, that is, he would not) help it.

But they say, we teach that mens Wills have a necessity of sinning imposed on them. But we have learnt that Habites do not determine the Will naturally, nor alway infallibly, but leave it free to a natural self-determination: But yet we know that it ordinarily determineth it self *according* to predominant habits. And there must be somewhat extraordinary to procure the Will to determine it self to good where it is habitually inclined to evil. So much may serve to vindicare our Doctrine about Freewill: And as for the cause of its captivity, it belongs not to this subject to speak of it, but to that of Original sin (where the said Doctor so notably playes his part) to which we shall not now digress.

The next instance of the Papist is this [*They (i. e. the Greeks maintain) seven Sacraments, you not.*] Repl. 1. This is another very immodest untruth: I wonder that men dare venture their souls upon a Religion that must be thus upheld by falsehoods. Your own Writers before alledged, witness that the *Greeks* deny the very use of confirmation and extreame Unction; and how then can they account them Sacraments! Nor do they take Marriage for a proper Sacrament. 2. We cannot dispute this point with you upon the bare name; Give us the definition of a Sacrament, and we shall give you our Reply. As a Sacrament signifieth any Christian mystery, or mysterious Ordinance signifying some spiritual thing, we doubt not but there are more then seven Sacraments, but not as it signifieth, an instituted signe, to
seal

seal the Covenant of Grace, and exhibit its great benefits. *Calvin* hath yielded to you, that in a larger sence Ordination is a Sacrament.

He next addeth [*They say that Christ dyed for all mankind; You say not, but onely for the Elect.*] *Repl.* Still more confusion, do not your own Schoolmen and other Divines say that he dyed, for All men sufficiently, and for the Elect onely effectually? And so do we! where then is the difference? Not so much in this point as in another conjunct: You say that its mans Free-will, that is the chief differencing cause, in making Christs death effectual for the salvation of the Elect; and we deny it, and say that it is Gods special Grace. 2. Do not you know that about this and the former point of Freewill, you differ as much among your selves, and that we say no more then your Dominicans do (no nor so much in the point of predetermination.) 3. Do you not know that half the Protestants (those whom you call *Lutherans*) do hold universal Redemption as well as you? Be it right or wrong therefore you should not impute the contrary to all.

We say that it was the sins of all mankind and not onely of the Elect that lay upon Christ in his suffering: and that God as Legislator of the old violated Law hath received a sufficient satisfaction for all, and that hereupon a conditional Pardon is granted to all by a Law of Grace, and that the condition is but their Acceptance of what is freely offered (according to its nature and use) and that all and onely they that perform this condition shall have Actual pardon and salvation. But then we do not say, that Christ did equally intend the procurement of the performance of this condition: but that he giveth some

an inseparable special Grace which shall infallibly procure it , which he doth not to others , who yet have so much as shall leave them in their own consciences and at his bar without any just excuse. I pray you shew us next what the *Greeks* say more then this. In particular that Reverend man against whom you write hath an excellent *M. S.* abroad for Universal Redemption.

The next feigned difference between us and the *Greeke* is this [*They confess that God hath given sufficient Grace to every one to be saved : You not , but only to the Elect*] *Repl.* You again wrong them , shew us where they say so if you can. You own that Doctrine your selves it seems ; and thereby discover your enmity to Grace ; Do you think that every childe , ignorant sot , or wicked person hath Grace sufficient to salvation ? If he have sufficient , either he needs no more , or he may be saved without more. And then it seems converting Grace is needless to an Infidel , for he hath enough already : then it seems , you will be beholden to God for no more Grace after the first hour of your conversion , nay after the first hour of your life or use of reason , to your death. For if you had sufficient for salvation the first hour , then what need you any more ; you will it seems pray God to keep it to himself , for you have enough already. I will tell you what the *Greeks* and we , and some of your selves hold , that is , that every man hath so much Grace (that is , Helpe and Mercy contrary to Merit) as is in its own kind sufficient to make him better then he is , and to bring him neerer to Christ or salvation , and which his owne will is obliged to make effectual by a right entertainment and improvement , and might do :

do : But we do not say that all men have sufficient Grace to believe to justification, or sufficient to salvation ; nay we say that no Believer hath sufficient Grace to salvation , till the soul pass from the body : for still he hath need of preserving Grace to the last breath. Men that are at a great distance from Christ may have sufficient Grace to come neer to him ; and justly perish if they refuse or abuse such Grace , though they never had Grace sufficient to believe ; because it is their own fault that they had it not.

The next pretended difference, is [*They pray and offer Sacrifice for the dead : You not*] *Repl.* I will see your proof of this too , before I will believe you. We know they do it not in the Popish sence , that is for delivering souls out of the fire of Purgatory , because they deny such a state. If you will read this Reverend Bishop whom you oppose in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, on that point, you will see the difference between the Ancients (and so the *Greeks*) praying for the dead and yours.

He addeth [*They invoke Saints and Angels ; you not*] *Repl.* Of this also see Bishop *Usher* in the fore-cited place. We take this for their error : and we do not take our selves to be of a different Church or Religion from every one that erreth.

He next addeth [*They worship the Cross and Images : you not*] *Repl.* But they do it not as many of yours , with Divine worship. Their worship is but reverence for the Relation sake ; and they will not so much as use any Statues or Graven Images as you do. And do not those you call *Lutherans* , do as they in this (though how rightly I say not ?)

He addes [*They honor reliques : you not*] *Rep.* We honor them as far as they have any true Relation to any honorable person. But we will not therefore carry them about us to keep away the Devil, or forge a multitude of lies about the cures which they miraculously perform : Nor do the *Greeks* so far as I know or hear.

The next is [*They maintain Traditions : you not*] *Repl.* They renounce your Traditions which are pretended to be part of Gods Word, supplying the defects of Scripture which is but the other half : For they maintain the sufficiency of Scripture to salvation. And some Traditions both they and we maintain: As the Tradition of the Scriptures themselves down to our hands; the Tradition of the Sum of Christianity in the Creed and Baptism, &c. Of which see what I have said elsewhere, in the Preface to the second part of the *Saints Rest Edit. 2. &c.* And in the determination in a book called, *The unreasonableness of Infidelity* : And see what the Bishop, whom you oppose hath said against the Jesuite on Tradition.

The next is [*They Auricular confession : you not*] *Rep.* 1. The Christians that deny your communion are divided in this : These called Nestorians and many more deny Auricular Confession : and others use it. 2. We deny not our selves, but that it is the duty of Christians when sin lyeth on their consciences, or when they have fallen into it, and know not the way out again to have recourse to their faithful judicious Guides for advice herein for the safety of their souls, and so far to confess as is necessary to such advice and safety. But we do not believe that we are bound to tell the Priest of every sin, no nor of every hainous sin : for in some cases we may have a fitter cure.

I will not go to a Pyhsician for every prick of a pin ; or cut finger, which many neighbors or my self can cure as well as he : I will not so far needlessly trouble him : Nor will I go to a bad unfaithful Physician , when I can have a better ; nor yet to an ignorant man, because he hath got the degree of a Doctor of Physicke, when I may go to an able man that professeth not Physick. You know the Application.

Its next said [*They Evangelical counsels and works of supererrogation : You not*] Rep. We acknowledge that there are many very good works. 1. Which are the duty of some few Christians upon some special occasions, and not of all or most. 2. Which are to the duty of those few, as that yet many of them are saved that perform them not ; being not made of the same necessity to salvation as some other duties are. And we see not how any man can reasonably imagine, that there is any work more excellent than others, which yet is not a duty ; when God hath commanded us to love him with all our heart, and might, and strength ; and to imploy all talents to the utmost for his Glory : and that any Duty can be neglected without sin, is as absurd. How the *Greeks* and we differ in this, we shall better know when you shew and prove it to us.

He next adds [*They the Merit of good Works : you not*] We acknowledge, that Good Works are pleasing to God through Christ, and rewardable ; and they say in sence no more : We thinke not meet to quarrel about the meer name. They renounce and abhorre the Popish Merit of condignity *ex proportionē operis* ; as is before said.

In the next place the confuter alledgeth his proofs of all these differences from us, and consent with them. The first proof is out of *Act. Theolog. Wittenberg. in Crispin. de statu Eccles.* in these words [*The Greek and Romane Church are divided onely in the controversie of Primacy, and variety of Ceremony*] *Repl.* I have not *Crispinus* now by me, and therefore can make no other answer but this, that if he be truly alledged, yet 1. Abundance of great differences (as about Sacraments, Orders, Traditions, &c.) may be comprised in that of Ceremony. 2. Else your own Writers will tell you that this is a mistake.

His second proof is from Sir *Edwin Sands Europe Specul.* To which I say 1. How unworthily did you conceal the multitude of differences mentioned in the same Author in the same place between you and the *Greeks*, and say there was but one? 2. By Purgatory *Sands* tells you after he means not your Purgatory: And its known the *Greeks* deny it: Though they think that the Saints have some less degree of glory distant from the face of God before the resurrection. 3. About Transubstantiation and the Mass *Sands* is mistaken. The *Greeks* hold a kind of Real presence, but not Transubstantiation: And the Mass of the Papists doth abundantly differ from theirs (as in the denyal of Transubstantiation, elevation, &c. may appear, and is at large by many of ours expressed, which may save me the labor of a recital.)

Next the ignorant Priest would by a Syllogisme prove the Bishop a Papist, and in the making of his Syllogisme he is out before he could reach the conclusion, and begins again, and yet would not blot out his former error, so wary is he that he lose not a line

line of his own writing. The mended Syllogisme is this [*Those who embrace the Communion of the Grecian Church notwithstanding the error of supremacy, cannot in reason refuse the Communion of the Romane for the same: But Mr. Ushers Church embraceth the Communion of the Greek Church notwithstanding that Error: Therefore, &c.*] Repl. 1. To the Major, it is falsly supposed that we refuse your Communion for that Error alone: It is for that with abundance more. 2. To the Minor, I answer by denying it: and say you shamelessly slander the Greek Church: They maintain not any Power of Governing the whole Church as the head of it, and Christs Vicar general, nor any infallibility, &c. as you do.

Next he will prove that Mr. Ushers Church can have no Union or Communion with the Greek Church at all: and that by this Syllogisme [*That Church which is a member of another Church, that other Church must also be a member of it: But the Greek Church is no member of Mr. Ushers Church: therefore Mr. Ushers is no member of the Greek Church.*] The Minor he proveth from *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Constantinople* and *Respons. Basil. Ducis Moscov.* Rep. 1. The part is not a part of another part, a member is not a member of another co-ordinate member; but of the whole. 2. I say, the proofs of your Minor are vain. It is not two mens sayings that can make the Greek Church and the Protestants so dis-joynd as not to be members of the Universal Church. If *Italy* tell *France*, and *France* again tell *Italy* that they are no part of *Europe*, it is not therefore true. If *Canterbury* tell *York* that they are not a part of *England*, it is not therefore true. Every childe is not a Bastard that is so called

by an angry brother. If Patriarch *Jeremiah* fit your turn (which I know not, for I have not seen him) why may not we as well plead the consent of Patriarch *Cyrill*, whose Protestant confession you may see in *Alstedius's Euclucopadia*, and elsewhere?

Next he comes to the *Abassines*, where (after the mention of their circumcision) he as falsely affirmeth, that [In all other things they profess the faith of the Catholike Church acknowledging the Pope the supreme head thereof, and Christs Vicar upon earth] which he proves by a confession exhibited to *Gregory* the 13. and recorded by *Possesine*. Rep. This is to make the foundation like the superstructure, and defend falshood with falshood. If you were so ignorant your selves as not to know the *Romane* juggling about that confession, you could not imagine the learned Bishop so ignorant. Not onely your own *Godignus de rebus Abassinorum*, may tell you, but the generality of your faction may sure inform you by this time, that all your cunning industry cannot get the *Abassines* under your Papal Yoak. And if you should prevail for the time to come, thats nothing to the time past. The *Abassines* (to let pass their errors wherein they differ from you and us) do communicate in both kinds, they believe the souls of Infants departing unbaptized to be saved because they spring from faithful parents: They reject Statues or massy Images: They elevate not the Sacrament, nor reserve it after Communion: Their Priests, labor, but beg not: The Emperor conferreth Bishopricks and Benefices: They use no confirmation nor extreame unction: They admit a first marriage in Bishops and Priests: They eat flesh on Fridays, And yet

yet this man saith they differ not from them.

The second Chapter is the meer ebullition of foolish malice, deserving no reply to those that do not desire to be deceived. He would prove that according to these lax principles of our charity, we may agree with Jews, Turkes, Mahometans! As if we needed a dispute to prove that these are no Christians, and that the *Greeks, Abassines, &c.* are: But such disputes do the Papists put us upon.

The Bishop had concluded in his Sermon, that [If we should survey the several professions of Christianity that have any large spread in any part of the world, and put by the points wherein they differ one from another, and gather into one body the rest of the Articles wherein all generally agree, we should finde so much truth in them, as being joyned with holy obedience may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting salvation; neither have we cause to doubt but as many as do walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded by superinducing any damnable heresies thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked conversation, Peace shall be upon them and Mercy and upon the Israel of God.]

And what hath the Confuter to say against this? Why first he begins with the Sacraments, to try whether those commonly agreed on may save. And here he first tells us, that [Some Churches are for seven, some for three, and some for two, and no more: therefore here is no agreement] Rep. 1. Let the nominal differences about the word Sacrament be first laid by (unless you think that word necessary to salvation) and then we shall the better see what real difference remaineth. 2. The two Sacraments then are confessed by

by all, and the use of the rest which you call Sacraments: This much (in its own place) then may save, where no more is confessed. 3. You vainly put in the *exclusion of more*, for thats none of the things that all agree on: All agree that there are two Sacraments: and those may save. But all agree not that there is but two. This man therefore seems to dote; when he should gather up the common agreements according to the Bishops proposall, he gathers up the disagreements, or vainly pretendeth that we agree in nothing. What, do not you confess that Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Sacraments? and do not we do so too?

Next he comes to the use of Baptisme, and saith that [*The Romanes and Greeks, say, that there is no other use of baptisme but to wash away sin: The Protestants of England and Geneva say, that it is no laver of Regeneration at all, but onely a seal of Gods promise made to the party baptized: and that the childe unbaptized may be saved and the baptized damned.*] Repl. 1. You make your selves (much more the *Greeks*) worse then you are. Do not your own maintain that Baptism admitteth into the Church and granteth many other priviledges, besides washing away sin. 2. We say, that to the children of promise it doth secondarily and by obfignation wash away (or pardon) sin by way of obfignation and solemne exhibition, as the promise doth primarily as a deed of gift or legal Grant: as also that in the same way it secondarily conveyeth further Grace according to the capacity of the subject, and admitteth into the Church. And all this is commonly confest by your selves and all Christians of the *Greek* or *Abassine* Churches, &c. This much alone without your addi-

additions is as much (at least) as is necessary to salvation, to be believed concerning baptism.

Next he cometh to the Lords Supper, and saith, that one party holdeth the real presence and the other not? And what of this? Doth that prove the insufficiency of what all are agreed on? what we hold, you deny not: We hold the signifying, and sealing and exhibiting use of the Sacrament (though we deny Transubstantiation) And dare you deny these? We hold that it is the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christs body and blood offered once on the Cross for the sins of the world: and that it is a means of Church-communion: And dare you deny these? Lay by your Additions, and that which we are all agreed in is enough to salvation.

His next instance is about Faith; Because we say, that Historical faith may be in Devils, and Miraculous faith in the wicked, and *Calvin* defineth justifying faith to be a firme and certain knowledge of the love of God to us, &c. and the *Lutherans*, that it is an undoubted perswasion of the pardon of our sins and adoption, &c. and this faith is by the Council of *Trent* condemned to the pit of hell, therefore he concludeth that there is no saving faith common to Papists and Protestants.

Repl. Here again you vainly and fallaciously bring in the disagreements, and over pass the agreements. 1. We are agreed that all those which the Protestants call the Canonical books of Scripture are the word of God: and true, and particularly all the Articles of the Creed, and many things more: We are agreed that Christ and life is offered by the Universal promise in the Gospel to all that hear it: and that all must first believe the truth of this promise and then
heartily

heartily consent to the offer and accept the benefit, and also believe and fear the threatening, and joyn sincere love and obedience to all this. This we are all agreed in: And this is certainly saving to all that sincerely believe and do as they thus profess. But then, whether Historical faith be common or not? whether assurance or strong perswasion of pardon, be faith, or justifying faith, with other the like, these we are not agreed in; and without these we may be saved.

The next exception is only this, The Bishop tells us not what be those Heresies that destroy this common faith. *Rep.* And doth that cross his former charitable conclusion? What? because he undertakes not an alien task? Why in general, they are any thing that is so held as that the common Articles of faith cannot be held with it, and that practically.

The sum of the next passage, is this [*That its absurd for us to call them the true Church, or say they may be saved, when we have charged them with so much error and idolatry, &c*] *Repi.* 1. We onely say that you are a polluted part of the Church. 2. If your salvation be made so difficult by your errors look you to that: The Bishops conclusion (of the sufficiency of the *communiter credita*) is nevertheless sound, though you destroy your selves by your corrupt additions. 3. Multitudes among you believe not your Infallibility, Transubstantiation, and many the like errors. 4. Many that behold them as opinions speculatively, may yet hold the contrary truths practically, not discerning the contradiction.

I would gladly have shewed the vainty of the rest of that Pamphlet, because I see he hath contracted
most

most of their common cavils into a narrow room; but the rest is less to our present purpose, and the same things are already answered by many; and therefore I shall no further Digress in the pursuit of this Confuter, having already said so much against the chief of their objections, as may leave the impartial Reader confirmed in it, *That notwithstanding the Popish cavils to the contrary, it is apparent, that the Christian Catholike Reformed Religion commonly called Protestant is a safe way to Salvation.*



QUERY.

*Whether Popery be a safe way to
Salvation? Neg.*

IT is not as other mens Judges that we determine this Question; to their own master do they stand or fall: but it is to render an account of our own Belief and practice, and for our further confirmation in the truth for the defence of it against gain-sayers, and for the establishing of our people against the sophistry and seduction of Deceivers.

For the explication of the terms, I shall tell you
1. What I mean by *Popery*. 2. What I mean by *Salvation*. 3. What by *the way* to it. 4. What by the word *Safe*.

1. *Popery* is a certain farrago, a mixture of many grievous errors in the doctrine of Faith, Government and Worship, expressed in their Authorized writings,

ings, especially in their decretals and Councils, corrupting the Christian Religion which they profess; the whole being denominated from that one falsehood, that the Pope of *Rome* is, the Universal Bishop, and Visible Head of the Universal Church and Christs Vicar-General on earth, and that only is the Catholike Church, and those only Catholiks that so believe.

Where note 1. That the Papists professing to be Christians, do first own the substance of Christian doctrine, and then corrupt it, and contradict it by this fardle of their own inventions superadded. They profess to believe the holy Scriptures to be the word of God, and to be true: every Book that we believe (and more) They profess to believe all the Articles of the ancient Creeds commonly called the Apostles, the *Nicene*, or *Constantinopolitane*. It is not the Christianity or true doctrine which they profess, which we call *Papery*. 2. It is therefore onely their own invented corruptions, by which they contradict the Christian verity which they profess, which we call *Papery*. 3. Note, That the common denominating corruption, is the forementioned doctrine of the Popes Universal Episcopacy and Headship, or a supremacy at least, if not Infallibility: and that the Catholike Church, and the *Romane* Church is all one: and the Pope is the visible center of its Unity. 4. Note also that as to the rest of their corruptions, they agree not among themselves what is to be esteemed of their faith or Religion, and what not: and therefore it cannot be expected that we should give you an exact enumeration of the points of their faith, and so a compleat description of *Papery*, which is such a self-contradicting unreconcilable

able hodge podge. But their errors may be distributed into these three ranks. 1. Those that are established by the Pope and his (supposed) general Council: These they all receive and own. 2. Those that are established by the Popes Decretals without a Council. These some own as points of their faith, and some reject them. I will not adde as the third, those that are established by a Council without the Pope; not because there never was a Council that dissented from him in Good, but because it is a difficult matter at least to find any Council that did go beyond or without him in Evil, or erred without his Approbation. 3. The third sort therefore shall be those opinions that are commonly maintained by their most Approved Writers which are published in books that are licensed and commended by the Popes Authorized agents, but are not determined by the Pope or his Council. These though they contend for, and lay great weight on them in their disputations, yet dare they not own them as any part of the matter of their faith, lest they seem to be what they are; divided and mutable. A man would think that those voluminous hot disputes about Divine things, did intimate that the Authors did *fide divinâ* believe those points which they do so zealously dispute of. But if it be their pleasure, that we should so distinguish, we will call the rest the *Popish faith or Religion*, and these last, the *Popish opinions*, because we would fasten on them nothing but their own.

If you ask me, which be those doctrines which they take for points of faith, which we call Popery; I must refer you to their Decretals and Councils on one side, and Gods word on the other; and all the doctrines

Doctrines in whose their Canons or determination^s that are against the word of God, are the doctrines which we mean by this name. If they do lay greater stress upon any one point than others, its likely to be on those that are put into their Creeds and Vows, and therefore I shall onely recite the latter half of their *Tridentine Creed*, seeing they will own that or nothing: When they have begun with the ancient *Constantinopolitane Creed*, containing the true Principles of Christian Religion, and have ended that they proceed thus as followeth.

The Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions, and the rest of the Observations and constitutions of the same Church, I do most firmly admit and embrace. I admit also the sacred Scripture according to that sense which the Holy Mother the Church hath held and doth hold, to whom it belongeth to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures: and I will never take and interpret it, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. I do profess also that there are seven truly and properly Sacraments of the new Law instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary to the salvation of mankind, though not all to every one; to wit, Baptisme, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, extreame Unction, Order, and Matrimony: and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptisme, Confirmation, and Order, cannot be reiterated without Sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved Rites of the Catholike Church in the solemn Administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments. I do embrace and receive all and singular things which in the Holy Council of Trent were defined and declared about Original sin and Justification. In like manner I do profess

fess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living, and for the dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is Truly, Really, and Substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a change made of the whole substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of Wine into his blood; which change the Catholike Church calleth *Trasubstantiation*. I confess also that under one kind only, whole and entire Christ, and the true Sacrament is taken. I do constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are holpen by the suffrages of the faithful. As also that the Saints reigning with Christ, are to be revered and called upon, and that they do offer prayers to God for us: and their reliques are to be revered (or honoured.) I do most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, and of the Mother of God ever a Virgin, as also of other Saints, are to be had and kept, and that due honor and Veneration is to be given them. I affirm also that the power of Indulgences is left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. I acknowledge that the holy Catholike and Apostolike Church of Rome, is the Mother and Mistresse of all Churches: And I do promise and swear true Obedience to the Pope of Rome successor of Blessed Peter Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Also all other things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred Canons, and Oecumenical Councils, and especially of the holy Synod of Trent, I do without doubting receive and profess: and also all things contrary, and all heresies whatsoever condemned by the Church, and rejected, and Anathematized, do I in
 like

like manner condemn, reject and Anathematize. This true Catholike faith, without which no man can be saved, which at the present I do voluntarily professe, and truly hold, the same will I take care to hold and confess entire and inviolate, by Gods help, most constantly, even to the last breath of my life; and as much as in me lyeth, to be held, taught and preached, by those that are under me, or those whose care belongs to me in my office. This I. N. do Promise, Vow, and Swear, so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.

So far the *Trent* Confession, which I the rather recite that you may see what their Religion is in their own words and oaths; where you see also that this is but a small part of it; for it is moreover as large, as all the Council of *Trent*, and all other Oecumenical Councils and holy Canons; of the Impossibilities and self-contradictions of which faith, we shall say more anon.

So that I conclude that it is not Christianity, but this additional Leprosie which we call by the name of Popery: they believe this much more then we (or a great part more) and by believing more, they believe less, while they destroy the sound faith which they before seemed to profess.

2 For the next term to be explained [*Salvation*] we mean by it principally, *Everlasting Glory*; and withall those beginnings of it inclusively which we have in this life, consisting in our Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, Consolation, and Perseverance.

3. By the term [*Way*] we mean, such necessary means as are prescribed us by God for the attainment of Salvation, either as to our Belief, or our Affecti-

on and Practice according to the directions of the doctrine which we do believe.

4. As to the sence of the word [*Safe*] it signifieth that which is free from danger, or which tendeth to a mans welfare. Now here is a double safety considerable in Doctrines answerable to a double danger. First, its one thing to be safe from any sin in the way to Salvation; and so we may well say that Popery is no safe way which leadeth to so much sin: But thats not all that is here intended: But its another matter to be so deep in sin, as not to be *safe* from the Everlasting Punishment, but that salvation it self is endangered thereby: and this we principally intend. And whereas there are several Degrees of Danger, we mean that true Popery heartily entertained and practiced, doth leave but small *probability*, if any *possibility*, of the Salvation of any that do persevere impenitently therein to the end.

Though you may see what I deny in what is already said, yet for the greater perspicuity, I shall express my sence in these few Propositions following.

Prop. 1. That Christian doctrine contained in the holy Scriptures which the Papists do profess to believe, is of it self without their corruptions, a safe way to salvation.

Prop. 2. Whatever errors are held by Papists or any others, which do consist with a true practical belief of the foresaid Christian doctrine which they confess, and we are agreed in, those errors shall not exclude the erroneous from Salvation.

Prop. 3. The Papists do not expressly in termes and sence deny any fundamental point of faith.

Prop.

Prop. 4. Its possible even practically to hold an error, which by remote consequence contradicteth a fundamental Truth, and yet to hold that truth practically, and so to be saved. For either all moral errors in Theology (as *Amesius* thought) do contradict the Foundation by consequence, by reason of the necessary concatenation of Truthes; or most at least.

Prop. 5. There are some errors so great that if they were cordially and practically held, would be inconsistent with the cordial practical holding of the Foundation; which yet may be held but speculatively and notionally in consistency with the cordial and practical belief of the fundamentals; and the person not knowing the contradiction may be saved.

Prop. 6. Multitudes of people while they take common termes in Divinity in a wrong sence, do maintain Propositions which by plain consequence, if not directly contradict the Fundamentals according to the proper genuine sence of the words; when yet in the sence as they mistake and misuse them in, there is no contradiction. Even as many on the other side, do hold the Christian verity in words, who in sence deny it.

Prop. 7. We have great reason to think that many millions of the Laity among the Papists, if not the far greatest part of them, do not cordially embrace the most of the Popish corruptions in doctrinals, nor the most dangerous of them.

I. Because they do not understand them, and so cannot so much as speculatively receive them. It is not one of a hundred, perhaps of many hundreds among them, that knows all contained in the Council of *Trent* alone, much less in all the rest of the

Council, and Canons and customes wherein they place their Religion. Nay perhaps its but few of their Clergy that know this comparatively. So that it is but an implicate general belief that they can give to such Canons as are unknown, which is not a belief of the particular doctrines contained in them, as such.

2. Because (I hope among most or many of them) they are first taught the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and ten Commandments (or at least the Creed, and Decalogue, though the Lords Prayer be usually taught them in Latine) which contain the Fundamentals of Christian faith and practice: and therefore we have reason to hope that these are deeper in their minds than any contradictory doctrines: especially when they must have so much time afterward, to build upon this foundation their hay and stubbles, that we have great reason to hope that it is but few that thoroughly understand or entertain them.

3. Because we know that the generality of the people, or a very great part of them, do look upon their Clergy as having a carnal self-interest to carry on, and so far have had and different thoughts of them; though they are yet captivated by them too much.

4. Because we see that the Pope is faine to keep them in subjection by the most cruel force of secular power: by the bloody inquisition, tormenting and burning them, or raising wars against them to ruine them; or else by worldly honors, dignities, and riches to entice and ensnare them; which were needless if he could carry it by the cogent evidence of his doctrines or their understandings.

5. Because we see by experience, that even here with us among their few most zealous and voluntary Profelites, it is but very few that call themselves *Romane* Catholikes, or Papists, that indeed know what Popery is: Nay most of them, if you do but name some points of the Popish faith, will tell you that you slander them; and they hold no such thing. I have talked with many of the Laity, and find very few that will own the doctrine of mans Merits, but profess to rest on the Merits of Christ onely: The like I could say of other points: By which it is plain that the Priests do hide from the Laity so much of the venome of their doctrine as they think will prove distastful to them, and dare not let them know the worst.

Prop. 8. These persons before described, together with that part of the Clergy, who cast off much of the *Romane* corruptions, and yet adhere to their party, are not *full and compleat Papists*, but onely Papists *secundum quid*, incompleat, and of a lower sort, and so are not in so great danger of damnation as the rest: even as the Scab is not so bad as the Morpew, nor the Morpew so mortal as the Elephantiasis, or the full Leprosie; though all are of kindred one to another.

9. *Pro.* Yet these better sort of Papists are commonly tainted with so much of their corruptions as makes their salvation much more difficult; so that we may well judge that it is fewer by far that are saved among them, then in the Reformed Churches. Even as it is possible for men to scape catching the Plague that live among the infected, and its possible for the infected to escape with their lives, but where one scapes many dye, and its I think more

dangerous to live in an infected house or air then in a sound one.

Prop. 10. A man that cordially and practically receiveth the whole body of Popery, and so is a compleat Papist, is in so great danger of eternal damnation, as that it is a very hard question whether it be possible for him at the same time to hold cordially the fundamentals of Christianity, and so to be in a state of Salvation? Which because it is so hard a question that Protestant Divines are of different opinions about it, some thinking it *possible* for such to be saved, and some *impossible*, I will not presume here to determine it, seeing the matter in hand doth not call for the determination of it.

Prop. 11. Whosoever is saved among the Papists; whether he be more or less tainted with their errors, it is not *By Popery* that he is saved, but *from Popery*, or against it by the Christian faith. So that if a Papist may be saved, it must be as a Christian; and not as a Papist: Popery and Christianity having some contrariety; so that it must be by the prevalency and predominancy of the Christian faith against Popery if ever he be saved. If a lyer might be saved it must not be by lying, but by faith in Christ and repentance. If a Leper, or one that hath the Plague, or the like diseases, may live, it must not be by the Leprosie or Plague that they must live; but by natural vigor and the help of Medicine by which they are preserved from the killing power of these diseases.

And here you may take notice, what a fond and vain delusion it is, by which the Priests do perswade the poor people that their Religion is a safer way to heaven then ours, even because that we confess a
Papist

Papist may be saved, but they affirm that a Protestant cannot be saved. For 1. Some Protestants think they may be saved, and some deny it. 2. Those that think they may be saved do withall think that it is not *by Popery*, but *against* it and *from* it. 3. And they think that its very hard, and therefore that they are very few that are saved among them, in comparison of the number saved among us. And is not this a fair and comfortable encouragement to their poor seduced followers, that some among us confess that as its possible for here and there one to escape of a raging Pestilence, so may some Papists be saved. 4. Their condemning of all Protestants doth make themselves worse, but it makes us never the worse, nor our case ever the more dangerous. Christ hath told us that all men shall know us to be his disciples, by Loving one another, and hath bid us, judge not that we be not judged, for with what judgement we judge, we shall be judged: and *Paul* tells us, that charity thinketh not evil, but hopeth all things: Is it then a good & Christian arguing to say that they are safer then we, because they are more censorious, and rash condemners of others? Then he that hath least Charity is of the safest Religion. Suppose that a company shut up in a Pesthouse, being raging mad with the Plague, or otherwise distempered in their brain, should cry out, that all the Town are sick and will certainly dye, except themselves. Were it wise reasoning now to say [You confess that some of those that are sick in the Pesthouse may escape; but they say that none of you that are out can escape, therefore it is safer to be with them then with you.] Even such is the reasoning of the Popish Priests in the present case. It is the disease of Popery that of
its

its own nature causeth them to condemn all the world except themselves : And it is because we are free from their disease, that makes us not so rash and hasty in condemning them : But yet as charitable as we are to them, we are so charitable withall to our selves, that we would not be in their case, for all the world.

Prop. 12. We may well conclude therefore that whether a Papist may be saved or not, that certainly Popery is no safe way to Salvation.

If a cup of Poison be tempered for the killing of men, and one drinks it all, and dyeth, another drinks almost all, and dyeth, another drinks lesse, and yet using no remedy dyeth, another drinks but a little, or taking more, yet useth some effectual Remedy, and so with much ado scapeth death. I think, notwithstanding the scaping of these last, we may well conclude that [Poison is no safe or wholesome food.]

I come now to prove the Proposition last expressed.

In general 1. Popery is No way to salvation; Therefore it is no safe way. God hath nowhere prescribed it as a way to salvation; therefore it is not a way to salvation.

2. It is the way toward damnation, and from salvation; therefore it is no safe way to salvation.

The proof of all together shall be next fetcht from some general reasons drawn from the dangerous nature of Popery; For if I should descend to every particular error I must be voluminous, and do that which is sufficiently done by multitudes already.

Arg. 1.

Arg. 1. *Those doctrines which are founded upon a Notorious falshood, and resolved into it, are not a safe way to Salvation. But such are the doctrines which we call Popery: Therefore.*

For the Minor, They are founded on and resolved into the doctrine of the Popes Infallibility, or at least his Councils: This the Papists do confess and maintain. But that this is a Notorious falshood, is evident.

1. In that it is notorious that Popes have erred, and judicially erred, and erred in matters of faith. *Bellarmino* is put to answer to no less then fourty instances of erring Popes; and how shamefully or shamelessly he doth it, any Learned man that will search the records and peruse the case, may soon discover.

2. It is notorious that Councils have erred. I shall not now intermix my Testimonies to interrupt the plain course which I have begun, but rather give you the proof of all this distinctly by it self in the next disputation.

3. The Papists themselves confess this that we affirm. I mean, One part of them do confess that the Pope may err (as the *French*) and the other (the *Italians* and *Spaniards*) confess that a Council may erre. One saith the Infallibility is not seated in the Pope; and the other that it is not sealed in a Council, particular or general, of which see *Bellarmino de Conciliis lib. 2. cap. 10. & 11.* In which last he seeks to prove that a General Council may erre.

1. When they dissent from the Popes Legates. 2. And when they consent with the Legates, if those Legates

*Popes have
erred
& consequently
will*

gates do cross the Popes instructions. 3. Yea if the Legates have no certain Instructions, the Council and all they, may consent in error: And he proves the two former by the instance of the second Council of *Ephesus*, and the *Constantinopolitane* Council in the time of Pope *Nicholas* the first, which erred, saith he, because the Popes Legates followed not his instructions. The third he proves by the Council of *Basil* Sess. 2. which together with the Popes Legate did by common consent Decree, that the Council is above the Pope, which now (saith *Bellarmino*) is judged erroneous.

4. Some Popes themselves have confessed that they are not the seat or chief subject of the infallibility: As *Adrian* the sixth who hath wrote his judgement of it, that the Pope may err out of Council. And in my opinion we shall do the Pope much wrong if we shall not believe him when he speaks the truth, and tells us that he is fallible. Did *Bellarmino* better know Pope *Adrians* understanding, then the Pope knew his own? Surely I must do as I would be done by: and if any man should perswade me that I know that which I do not know, or that I am infallible, when I know my self subject to error. I should confidently expect that all men would rather believe me of my self then believe another of me that speaks the contrary: And so will I believe Pope *Adrian* that he was fallible.

But of this more in the next disputation; where you shall have fuller proof.

Arg. 2. If Popery do build even the Christian Religion it self (as held by them) on a foundation that is utterly uncertain, or else certainly false, then is it no safe way to salvation: For it would extirpate Christianity it self. But the Antecedent is true, as I shall thus prove.

1. They are divided and disagreed among themselves even their greatest Learned Doctors about the very foundation of their faith, as I shall further shew in the next argument: They believe upon the infallible judgement of the Church, and they are not agreed what that Church is.

2. They build the assurance of their faith upon such a ground as none of the common people, nor any Doctors in the world, can have the knowledge of: therefore their faith must needs be uncertain. To manifest this I shall review one leaf that I wrote heretofore on this subject in the Preface to the second Part of the *Saints Rest*.

It is the Authority of the Church they say, upon which we must believe that the Scriptures are the word of God, and were it not for the Churches authoritative affirmation, they would not believe it (saith one of them, no more than *Aesops Fables*) Now suppose they were agreed what this Church is, and that we now take notice of their more common opinion, that is is, all the Bishops of the Church headed by the Pope, or a General Council approved of and confirmed by the Pope, I would fain know how the faith of any of us that live at a distance, yea or of any man living, can be sure and sound, when all these following particulars must be first known,
before

before we can have such assurance. 1. It must be known that God hath given to the Church this power of judging what is his word, and what is a point of faith, and what not : so that that is so to us, which they judge so ; or that we are bound by God to believe them. Now which way doth God give the Church this Power? Is it not by Scripture, or unwritten tradition in their own judgment? And by what means doth he oblige us to Believe the Church in such determinations? It must be also by Scripture or unwritten Tradition by their own confession: For if they fly to universal Tradition, and natural obligation, they give up their cause, and let go their Authoritative Tradition and Obligation, as from their *Romane* Church. So that a man must (according to their doctrine) believe that the word of God (written or unwritten) hath given Power to the Church to determine what is the word of God before he can believe the word of God, or know it to be the word of God: that is, He must know and believe the word of God before he can know and believe it. Here is one of the impossibilities that lye at the very foundation of the *romane* way of faith.

2. Before men can know the Scripture to be Gods word, yea or their supposed unwritten verities, infallibly, according to the *Romane* way of believing, they must first know that the Church is infallible in her judgement, and this also must be known by the word of God, which is supposed not to be known yet it self.

3. They must also know, that it is the Church of *Rome* in particular that is the true Church and hath this power given from God.

4. To this end they must know that all those perverted

verted Texts (or some of them) that speak of *Peters* own person, were also spoke of certain successors of his, as well as of himself (as that on them the Church shall be built, and their faith shall not fail, &c.)

5. They must know that the Pope is this successor of *Peter*.

6. To this end, they must not onely know that *Peter* was at *Rome* (of which read well *Ulricus Velenus* in *Goldastus*) and was Bishop there, but they must know that he was the only Bishop there, or at least the chief, and that *Paul* was no Bishop there (who is more likely to have been) or else that he was the inferior, and that the Pope is *Peters* successor and not *Pauls*; or else succeedeth them both, and hath his infallibility but from one, unless the successors of the rest of the Apostles are infallible too.

7. If *Peter* and *Paul* were Bishops at once of one Church in *Rome*, then it must be known why they may not have two successors at once; and if there be two, which of them is to be believed when they disagree. But if *Peter* and *Paul* were Bishops of two particular Churches in *Rome*, the one of the Circumcision, the other of the uncircumcision, then it must be known by what right their successors made them one? or whether it were not by a failing or cessation of the Church of the Circumcision, when all Jews were banished from *Rome*, and so the Church of the uncircumcision only continuing, the Pope be not only *Pauls* successor.

8. And it must be known whether *Peter* were not Bishop of other Churches as well as of *Rome* (yea of *Antioch* before *Rome*) and so whether the Bishop of *Antioch* be not his successor as well as the Pope of
Rome

Rome, yea and the chief successor if it follow the right of primogeniture, either as to the Church or the Bishop; seeing *Antioch* was a Church before *Rome*, and *Peter* was supposed to be Bishop there before he was of *Rome*. And then if the Bishop of *Rome* and *Antioch* differ (as they do) how shall we know whom to believe, and how shall we know that the Bishop of *Antioch* is not infallible as well as the Pope of *Rome*?

9. It must be known what it is that makes a Pope, what is necessary to his being *Peters* successor. Is it enough that he step up into the chair and call himself Pope? Or that his party call him so? Then if any Heathen or *Arrian* conqueror, though a Lay man did so, he should be Pope, And he that conquers *Rome* may make himself *Saint Peters* infallible successor at any time. But if there must be an ordination and Election, then it must be known whether every Ecclesiastical Ordination or Consecration, and Election will serve or not. If it will, then when there have been three Popes chosen and consecrated at once, they were all *Saint Peters* infallible successors, though one condemned the other: If not, then it must be known, who it is that hath the power of election (which being the act that determineth of the person, is the maine that must resolve our doubts) and also of consecration or ordination. And how shall the people know this, when the Clergy have been so disagreed among themselves.

10. And here it must be known whether the Cardinals have the sole power to elect? If they have, then how came they by it? And then, whether were all those that were elected by the people in the first ages, and by the Emperors in after ages, true Popes, or

or not : If they were not , then Saint *Peter* hath no successors , because of the interruption of the succession so long ; and the Church had then no visible head. If they were , then the sufficient power is not onely in the Cardinals. And if it be not onely in them , then whether are any of those true Popes that have been chosen onely by them of late ages ?

11. And so it must be known how a possibility of uninterrupted succession can be proved, when Popes have been chosen three several wayes , sometime by the people (or else there had not been so many slain at the election of *Damasus* , nor had the ancient Canons made this necessary to all Bishops) and sometime by the Presbyters of that Church , and sometime by the Emperors ; and now by titular Presbyters, who are Bishops of other Churches, and are incapable of being true Presbyters of the Church of *Rome*. If all these several wayes of Election may make true Popes, then it seems any way may serve, and then the three Popes at once will be all true : If not, then there hath been an interruption of the succession , and so according to their own Principles, there can be now no true Pope.

12. And here it must needs be known too, whether there be any thing in the person that is a qualification so materially necessary, that he can be no true Pope without it. If not, then a Pagan or a Mahometan may be Pope. If there be, then it must be known what that is, which few private men at least do know.

13. Particularly it must be known whether they that are known Hereticks , yea judged so by Councils, or by their own successors, and those that were

notorious Whoremongers, Sodomites, Murderers, Poisoning their Predecessors to get the Popedom, Simonists, buying the Popedom with money, &c. were capable of being true Popes?

14. If they are not capable, then we must all know that all the Popes were none such, when the Papists themselves confess they were such, before we can know that they were the infallible successors of Saint Peter.

15. But if such may be Popes, then must we know why a Mahometane may not as well be a Pope? or how an enemy of Christ and the Church should come to be a Son of Promise, and the Vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church, and whether such were infallible in their judging falshood to be truth, as they did?

16. And we must know, that the Pope onely is lawless, and under no power of Canons, or Decrees of former Popes and Councils? Or else many such Canons will proclaim their calling null: and so the succession still hath been interrupted. And if the Authority of the former Church oblige the Pope to believe, *e. g.* the truth of Scripture and Traditions, then why must not the Authority of the former Church in its Canons be as obligatory to him in point of duty and penalty, and so null his calling?

17. *Bellarmino* saith that it is agreed among all Catholiks that the Pope as a private Doctor may erre, through ignorance, even in universal questions of faith: Also that many Papists and Pope Adrian the sixth himself taught that the Pope as Pope may be a Heretick, and teach Heresie, so it be without a General Council: And that most of the
rest

rest do only hold, that whether the Pope be a Heretick or not, yet he cannot define any thing heretical, as to be believed by the whole Church: this saith he, is the most common opinion: *Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontif. li. 4. cap. 2.*

Now this being so we must be resolved, if a Pope be a Heretick in heart, and open profession, and yet if a General Council be called, this Pope cannot give his sentence in it according to his own belief, whether indeed we can prove that God hath promised to cause a Hereticke Pope to dissemble, and to speak against his own judgement, which is to lye, though the thing that he saith be true, or yet to tye his tongue that he shall not be able to speak that which he believes, and speaks at other times?

18. And whether the promise which they alledge to this purpose (I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not) be indeed fulfilled to a Heretical Pope. If not, then its evident that this promise belongs not to all Popes. If yea, then the faith of a Heretick doth not fail; which *Bellarmino* himself confesseth to be false. And here note what a naked shameful shift it is that *Bellarmino* makes about this text? He saith that [*There are two things promised there to Peter: The first is that Peter should never lose the true faith, though tempted by the Devil; The other privilege is, that he as Pope should not be able ever to teach any thing contrary to the faith; or that in his seat no man should ever be found that should teach against the faith: of which privileges, the first perhaps was not derived to his successors, but the second undoubtedly was derived to them*] So saith *Bellarmino de Rom. Pont. li. 4. cap. 3.*

Now mark how contrary this is to the sence of the

text. The promise that Christ made to *Peter*, was not to his tongue but to his heart : not that he should not speak against the faith, for he did deny Christ, and curse and swear that he knew not the man : but it was that his inward belief should not fail, and so that he should not fall from Christ, and consequently indeed that his heart should reduce the tongue it self. Now *Bellarmino* confesseth that perhaps that part of the promise that concerneth faith it self, reacheth not to *Peters* successors, but onely that which concerneth the tongue : which was directly none at all ; so that he gives up the true promise made to *Peter*, which was that his *faith* should not fail, and not that his tongue should not fail, and he forgeth another in its stead.

19. How can we be assured that this or any promise belongeth to the Popes, when the Papists themselves say that they were made to *Peter* before he was Pope. For so *Bellarmino* is fain to answer, when we say *Peter* himself erred in denying Christ, he saith [*Saint Peter when he denyed Christ, was not yet made Pope : For its manifest that the Ecclesiastical supremacy was given him in the last of John, when Christ after the resurrection bid him Feed my sheep*] *Bell. de Pontif. li. 4. cap. 8.*

20. It is of necessity that all Christians who believe upon the Popes authority, must know who it is that is the true Pope, and to be believed : And when there are many Popes at once pretending to that infallibility and authority, how can all Christians be resolved which is the true Pope when one Countrey owns one, and another owns another, whom shall the vulgar own that are out of reach and uncappable of understanding the quarrel? And then, who knows

knows which of them must be succeeded by the next? Nay can learned men tell? Nay can the Cardinals tell that choose them? And are we sure that any of the pretenders are true Popes? Shall we hear *Bellar-^{Pope}mine* in one particular case, that is in his answer to the 37. instance of Heretical Popes, to wit, *John^{alewd} 23.* who besides open Adulteries, Murders and o-
ther horrid wickedness, of which no less then fifty three Articles were put in against him at the Council of *Constance*, all confirmed, saith *Bellarmino*, by certain witnesses, he was moreover accused of most pernicious Heresie, even of denying the Resurrection of the body, and everlasting life. And to this *Bellarmino* answereth [*Joannem 23. non fuisse Pontificem omnino certum & indubitatum*, proinde non necessario esse defendendum, erant enim eo tempore tres, ^{3 pretend}
qui Pontifices haberi volebant, Gregor. 12. Benedict. 13. & Johan. 23. nec poterat facile judicari quis eorum verus ac legitimus esset Pontifex cum non deessent singulis doctissimi patroni.] that is [*I answer that John the 23. was not altogether the certain and undoubted Pope, and therefore he is not necessarily to be defended, for there were at that time three that would be accounted Popes, Gregor. 12. Benedict. 13. and John 23. and it was no easie matter to judge which of them was the true and lawful Pope, when there were not wanting to each one of them most Learned Patrons.*] And yet the same *Bellarmino* saith, *de Conoil. li. 1. cap. 8.* that its almost the common opinion that this *John, Alex 5.* were true Popes. ^{ed popes}

You see then the case of the poor people according to the Romish Religion: They cannot know the word of God to be his word but on the authoritative determination of the Pope: and who is the

true Pope it is impossible for them to know, when even most Learned men cannot know, and *Bellarmino* himself so long after saith, it could not easily be known.

21. Moreover, how can all Christians many hundred miles distant know whether indeed the Cardinals chose and consecrated him that is in the seat, or whether he forc't in himself, or bribed them to pretend what was not done, and so whether he have all the essentials of his call.

22. And if a Council must be the determiner either with the Popes, or alone, How shall the Christian world know that Christ hath promised infallibility to a Council, when there is no such promise in the word: much less can Infidels know this in order to their believing the word of God.

23. And how shall we all know what is a General Council, and when we have one? whether it must be all the Christian Bishops in the world that must meet? or the delegates at least of all? or whether some Countries, or part of all may serve? and then what Countries, or parts it must be? *Ballarm. de Conc. l. 1. c. 17.* Saith, that once the Patriarchs must be present, but now its not necessary because they are all Hereticks or Schismaticks. And how shall we know that ever there was such a thing as a General Council? For my part I see no probability that ever there were many, if any one such Council, was the Council of *Trent* General when the greatest part of the Christian world was absent? When all the Bishops of *Ethiopia, Egypt, Palestine, Greece*, with all the Turkes dominions were absent, besides the Protestants, and most of the Popish Bishops themselves.

24. How shall we be sure that all these, or the greater

greater part of them are true Bishops and lawfully called? If as *Bellarmino* saith *de Concil.* l. 2. c. 9. That the contrary be not manifest, be enough, then mans error can make Gods promise of Infalibility belong to those that it was never made to; or else God hath promised infalibility to all that may be Popes or Bishops for ought we know: and then it belongs not to the Pope and Bishops, but to all that seem such.

25. Yea that all those Bishops or most descend by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, which is made necessary, If they plead onely the Bishop of *Romes* succession to warrant all the rest, before the forementioned particulars be well answered, it will appear that *Romes* succession hath been frequently interrupted.

26. How shall men at a distance be sure that the Councils are indeed confirmed by the Pope?

27. How shall we be sure when all is done that we have the right sence of the Canons or Decrees of such Councils, when they speak as ambiguously as the Scripture, and the Papists think they can have no certainty of the right sence of that without a living judge: And if there be a living judge still of the sence of Councils, either he is as infallible as they, or not: If not, then he cannot make us infallibly certain by his Authoritative determination. If he be, then what need of a Council, when he is infallible alone?

28. When several Popes and Councils contradict one another, how shall we know which of them to believe? And this is no rare matter among them?

29. When the Pope and Council contradict each other, how shall the people know which is infallible?

30. When both Pope and Council contradict the express Scripture, must we take them for infallible, and believe that Scripture only on their words.

These or most of these must be known by all Christians, before they can believe the Articles of their Creed, or that Scripture is Gods word, according to the *Romish* grounds: When as it is impossible for any man to know them as true; they being either false or not evident and demonstrable. So that its now apparent that according to the Popish grounds, the People can have no certainty of the truth of their Religion, and that they shake the foundation of Christianity it self.

2. And lastly, not onely so, but they build on, a foundation certainly false, that is, the Popes infallibility or a Councils: as I shall prove in the next dispute where their fallibility will be further manifested.

Arg. 3. *If the Papists are not agreed among themselves either Clergy or Laity about the very fundamentals of their faith (or matters which they make of necessity to salvation) then Popery is no safe way to salvation: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore, &c.*

We need to go no further for the proof of the Antecedent then to what is said already. They commonly maintain that we must receive our faith and the Scriptures upon the Authority of the infallible Church: and they are not yet agreed among themselves, nor ever like to be what that infallible Church is. And the difference is not with a few inconsiderable dissenters, but in their main body. The Papists of *France* maintain that it is a General

ral

ral Council that is infallible, and that the Pope is fallible: The *Italians* maintain that a General Council is fallible, and the Pope is infallible. Some others think that both of them are fallible separated, but both infallible when they concur. And some think that they are both infallible though separated. If the Church be the foundation, and all must be received upon its infallible authority, then no man can be saved that knows not which this infallible Church is: either therefore the *French* or *Italians*, one part or the other of them do erre in their very fundamentals, when one saith, *This is the subject of infallibility*, and the other say, *This is it*. And if a Pope or General Council differ, to whom must the people hearken? One part of them saith that the Pope is above the Council; and others of them say the Council is above the Pope, and of this mind have been General Councils themselves, as the Council of *Basil* and *Constance*, and of this mind *Bellarmino* names, Cardinal *Cameracensis*, Cardinal *Cusanus*, *Joh. Gerson*, *Iac. Almain*, Card. *Florentin*, *Panormitan*, &c.

What a strange impudency then is it of these men, to make the silly deluded people among us believe, that they are all of one mind, and its we that are divided: when as they are never likely to agree in their very principles and great fundamental, *Who it is that is the infallible Judge?* And till men know *Who it is*, what the better are they to know, that such a judge there is seeing that the species existeth only in the individual, and no man can believe him, or apply himself to him as the infallible judge, till he know that it is he indeed that is such. See-

Seeing then according to their own principles, either the *French* Papists or the *Italian* and *Spanish* Papists must be in the way to damnation, how shall we know which it is and which to joyn our selves to with any safety? Were it not for weakening the Popes interest, they would burn the *French* Papists as Hereticks as well as us.

Arg. 4. If Popery be a new devised way to heaven such as the Apostles never knew, nor the Church after them for many a hundred year (in the main parts of Popery) then is it no safe way to salvation: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent.

The consequence they will not deny, that which the Apostles & the Primitive Churches went in is only the safe way to heaven (for there are not many safe ways) But that which the Papists as Papists go in, is not that which the Apostles and Primitive Church went in: therefore it is not the safe way. And that the Apostles and first Churches knew not Popery, but it is a new Religion, or new corruption of Religion, appeareth by comparing the particular points with Scripture and Antiquity: For Scripture which is the truest Antiquity, it may give any indifferent man just cause of suspicion that the Papists do so obstinately refuse to be tryed by it, which plainly shewes that they take it not to be on their side. And for the Councils and Fathers, for the first three hundred years or much more, they ordinarily scorn us for mentioning them to this end, because they say they wrote not of the points now in controversie, and therefore are unfit to determine them. But did not those ages take up their faith on the same grounds as we should do now?

And

And can they be all silent about the onely ground of faith? If the Pope of *Rome*, infallible authority had been the ground, would they not have told us so? How could they convert the infidels, and confirm believers without acquainting them with the grounds of their Faith? And what they took for the grounds their writings shew. Nay he that shall faithfully and impartially peruse the Writers of the first three- or four or seven hundred years, is blind if he see not the novelty of Popery, and in particular of the Popes infallibility, universal headship and Episcopacy, and his pretended authority to be the Judge of controversies, with the rest of his usurpations. Our Divines, *Chamier*, *Jewell*, *Usher*, *Field*, and many others have manifested this so largely, that it would be superfluous for me to do it after them, and somewhat will necessary fall in with the next dispute.

I do not deny but that many ceremonies, and many controverted doctrines were very ancient: as the use of Chrisme, and a white garment, and milke and honey to the newly baptized, exorcisme, confirmation by imposition of hands, the Memories of the Martyrs, with prayers and praises at their graves, or places of suffering; the oft use of the signe of the Crofs, the observation of *Lent* (as well as *Easter* and *Whitsontide*) not to kneel on the Lords day, not to eat things strangled or bloody, so the doctrines of the power of Free-will, and predestination upon foreseen faith, and the misuse of the terms [*Merit and Justification*] the denial of the perseverance of all Saints, &c. were too early and commonly entertained. But these be not the things that we call Popery, nor wherein the great difference

ence between us, and the *Romanists* doth consist. But as for the great points in difference between the *Papists* and us, it is so evident in all antiquity, that Popery is a novelty, and that they have devised a new way to heaven which the Apostles and the Churches for many hundred years did never know, that onely gross ignorance of the Churches records, or a willingness to be deceived, can keep men from the knowledge of it.

And here I might easily prove what is said of the novelty of Popery, even from the confessions of their own most learned writers, that so they may not say, it is concluded from our own misunderstanding of Antiquity; But that it would swell this disputation beyond the intended bulk and bounds. I shall onely give a brief touch in a few points of moment, which may shew you what to think of their charging us with novelty, and of their general pretences to Antiquity.

*novelty
of Popery*

Of the humane Ordination of Papacy, and its late increase beyond its ancient bounds, and the limitation of Ecclesiastical Power; I shall desire you to see what in the following Disputation is cited out of their Cardinal *Nicol. Cusanus*, a man, so violent for the *Eugenian* faction, that *Aeneas Sylvius*, afterward Pope *Pius* the second lamenteth that so learned a man should be the pillar of that Popes cause; and a man so close to Papal interest, and so addicted himself to domineering, that he opposed his Prince *Sigismund* Duke of *Austria*, and caused the same Pope *Pius* the second to take his part, and excommunicate *Sigismund* and all his Counsaillors, and his subjects, for taking this Cardinal prisoner by

by force of Armes; of which see the story in *Goldsmit*, with *Gregor. Hemburg's* (one of the Princes excommunicated Counsaillors) his Defence against the Pope and Cardinal: Yet this man himself in his books *de concordia* hath confessed enough to destroy the Popes cause, and take down the *Roman* tyranny, if they would stand to the principles of that confession.

Others also in the next disputation are mentioned as to that subject, which I shall therefore now pretermitt.

Polidore Virgil a Learned writer of theirs in his *lib. 8. de Invent. Rer. cap. 5. pag. 475. 476.* Saith [Item ut nullum conventum indici, nullumque a quibuscum actum haberi ratum liceret sine Romani Pontificis auctoritate. Marcellus primus omnium sanxit, deinde Julius & Damasus & Gregorius illud idem statuere] [i. e. [Also that no Assembly (or Council) should be called, nor any act of whomsoever be esteemed ratified without the Authority of the Pope of Rome, this Marcellus was the first that did ordain, and afterward Julius and Damasus and Gregory did ordain the same thing] And though this sufficiently proveth the novelty, yet *Polidore* is mistaken in taking this part of Papall Usurpation to be so ancient. For he took it on the authority of the decretals, which are meer fictions,

Of which I refer the Reader to

Blondellus de Decretal. The sum

of whose censure on *Marcellus*

Epistles is this [As the fre-

quent Barbarisme shew the

Author, so the following oft the version of

Hiereme, the exscribing of divers instances

Blondell. de Decret.
pag. 397. 403.

out of Innocent, Leo, Hilary, Gregory, Adrian I. and Acacius; shew that he was many ages later, then Marcellus] See also the full evidence that he giveth in his censures against the Epistle of S. Iulius and Damasus; and for Gregory, his Epistles to the contrary purpose are well known. So that by Polidorus confession this Papal usurpation is a novelty: but indeed many hundred years neerer then he imagined.

And what good this usurpation did, himself confesseth in the following words [*Though it first broke the conventicles of Hereticks --- Ita deinceps nihil attulit commodi, cum per id jam pene desitum sit a conciliis habendis, in quibus cuncta ex aequo tractarentur Pontifice, Romano ejusmodi negotium non magnopere curante*] i. e. [Afterwards it did no good, when by reason of this, Councils are almost ceased, in which all things should be equally handled, the Pope of Rome not much regarding any such matter] Where he addeth [That therefore Pope Martin the fifth in the Council of Constance decreed that a Council should be called every tenth year, which hitherto hath not been kept, and therefore Religion grows daily worse] Where by the way we may see what power the Laws of the Pope and General Councils have, and what a Religion Popery is, which sweareth men to believe and obey the Decrees of such Councils, which no man ever obeyed since they were made: For there hath been never since a Decennial Council: And the Pope himself by confirming that Council which decreed that a Council is above the Pope, did shew himself obliged to obey it, and so to have called a Council accordingly. But all others must swear to that as Gods Word and infallible, which themselves contemne. But to proceed. The

The same Polidore Virgil lib. 8. cap. 1. g. 456. shews that the beginning of Indulgences was not till Gregory appointed his stations, and made them a reward. And shewing that they were grounded on the Doctrine of Purgatory, he bringeth in Bishop Fisher of Rochester to witnesse, 1. That Indulgences are lately brought in. 2. And

Reffers. Cons. Lulderm.

that even of Purgatory *Apud priscos nulla vel quam rarissima fiebat mentio; sed & Græci ad hunc usque diem non est creditum esse: quam diu enim nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura, nemo quesivit indulgentiarum, nam ex illo pender omnis indulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas purgatorium, quorsum indulgentiarum opus erit? Ceperunt igitur Indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorii concitatus aliquandiu trepidatum est*] i. e. [with the ancients there was no mention of Purgatory, or exceeding rare: And the Greeks believe not that it is to this day: And as long as there was no care about Purgatory, no man sought for indulgences; for all the estimation of indulgences depended upon that. If you take away Purgatory, what use is there of indulgences: indulgences therefore did then begin, when men had trembled a while at the pains of Purgatory] So far Bishop Fisher their Martyr.

Polidore Virgil reciting these words, next to them addeth [*Quam forte cum tanti sint Admonitionum magis certa ex ore Dei expectabas*] [Perhaps expected to have had these things as more certain from the mouth of God, seeing they are of such moment] A sufficient hint that he had more in his mind if he durst have spoken out.

Yet

*Indulgen
ces began
th punga
tory*

See Mr. Sing's Rejoinder in Defens. of Bishop Usber p. 78. 79, 80, 81, &c.

Yet note that the profit of indulgences is expressly sworn to in the new *Trent* Creed as part of their Belief.

This passage of *Fishers* was alledged by Bishop *Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, and the like from *Cajetans* confessing that the beginning of indulgences is not known: What the adversaries can say against these citations, you may see confuted by Mr. *Sing* in his Rejoinder in Defence of Bishop *Usher* against the Jesuite, pag. 81. 82, 83.

That the use of the Sacrament in one kind is a new invention, is commonly confessed by them. See *Albaspinaus* a sober Bishop of theirs in his observations, after his notes on *Optatus*, cap. 4. de *Communione Laica*, pag. 10. 11. shewing the novelty of the now *Romish* Communion. And *Gregor. de Valentia* the Jesuite confesseth that *minime constat*, it is not known when the custome of receiving the Sacrament in one kind onely began, but that it was not by any Decree of a Bishop, but crept in by some custome of the people. Of which also see Bishop *Usher* *ibid.* and his Defender Mr. *Sing* p. 78. 82, 83.

About the beginning of Monckery, see *Polidore Virgils* confess. lib. 7. cap. 1. pag. 414. 415. 416. And that [*Monachi primo omnium introduxerunt in Ecclesiam Dei vota sacra, & vestimenta profana simul religiosa fecerunt*] [*Monkes were the first of all men that brought into the Church of God, sacred vows, and made common (or profane) garments become Religious.*] pag. 424.

Of the beginning of forbidding Priests to marry, see the same *Polid. Virgil.* lib. 5. cap. 4. pag. 293, &c.

Of Peters supremacy the same Polidore saith l. 4. c. 6. p. 240. [*Veruntamen existunt etiam nunc, &c.* There are some now that contend that Peter had power over all the Apostles: of which it belongeth not to us to determine, who are onely enquiring of the original of Priesthood: but some think the contrary, because Paul seemeth to deny it, &c.] Where he addeth more reasons.

Of the Original of Cardinals, and the changes of the Electors of Popes, see him also l. 4. c. 9. where also he saith pag. 252. [*Verum cum postea Bonifacius 3. ab Imperatore Phoca impetrasset ut in omnes Episcopos prerogativam haberet, omniumque caput perpetuo foret, iam tum Romanus Pontifex multo quam antea unam cum suo urbano sacerdotum senatu cunctis sine controversia prestare auctoritate capit, ac simul illi presbyteri quibus Tituli dati, quibus Christianorum animas curandi munus delatum fuerat, eo Cardinalium nomine velut suprema illius dignitas proprio cum primis honestari capit.*] Here you have a hint of the Original of the very new frame of the Romish Church.

Many more points of the Romish way doth he in that Book discover to be novel. And in opposition to all their way if you will see how he describeth the Reformed Religion, peruse his narrative of the occasion of the Reformation, pag. 410. cap. 4. li. 8. where he saith [*Ita licentia parva loquendi: secta brevi tempore mirabiliter crevit qua Evangelica dicta est eo quod, haud ullam asseveret recipiendam esse legem qua ad animarum salutem pertineat nisi quam Christus aut Apostoli dedissent*] i. e. [Having once leave to speak, that sect did marvailously increase; which is called Evangelical, because they

I

affirm

affirm that no Law is to be received which belongeth to salvation but what is given by Christ or the Apostles] Thus you see what the Protestant Religion is and whence called Evangelical, and wherein it principally differeth from Popery, from the mouth of a Papist himself (an Agent of the Popes with the King of England H. 7. An Archdeacon, and at last the Dean of Pauls in London, from whence he removed because of the entrance of the English changes under H. 8)

And though he say that it then begun, meaning Luthers particular Reformation, yet what is like to be the end of it in the next words he subjoynes his Prognostick [*Mansurum ut videtur quoad Christum ipse populum suum culpâ rectorum ita in duas sectas sejunctum, rursus coegerit, a quo istud optimum quisque maxime petere precarique debet, ut ne major indidem fiat Religionis labes*] [Its like to remain till Christ himself shall again bring together his people,

* Note that he calls the Papists a Sect as well as the Reform- ed.

Who by their Rectors faults are thus divided into two * Sects ; from whom every good man ought especially to beg and pray for it, lest Religion do daily decay] more and more.

The novelty of their doctrine *de efficaciâ Sacramenti ex opere operato* is not onely by subtile Scotus but many more of their own confessed to be new. More of their corruptious are by their own Writers confessed to be novelties; and therefore it is great immodesty in the Papists to pretend the Antiquity of Popery, though we easily grant them the Antiquity of their Christianity. In so much as they agree with us they may prove

prove their Religion to be ancient: but its new in the points wherein we differ, and most new in the greatest differences. Bishop *Usher* in his Answer to the Jesuites challenge, and in his book *de Statu & Successione Ecclesiarum*, hath proved the novelty of the main body of their corruptions, especially the points of whose antiquity themselves most boasted of, and this distinctly and fully to their perpetual confusion, beyond all reply.

If therefore the Romanists would have us return to their communion (not to their subjection; for that we never owed them) let them but cast off their novelties and return to the ancient faith and practice of the *Roman* Church, and we shall do it speedily and do it gladly: They shall see that we are so far from affecting an unnecessary separation, that we will embrace them in a lawful communion with all our hearts. I cannot better express my hearty desires of this, then in those hearty words of *Hier. Zanchy* Vol. 3. *Thes. de Eccles. Milit. Thes. 19. Col. 540.* [*Non enim ab Ecclesia Romanâ simpliciter & in omnibus defecimus: sed in illis duntaxat rebus in quibus ipsa defecit ab Apostolica, atque adeo a seipsa, veteri & pura Ecclesia: neque alio discessimus animo, quam ut si correctâ, ad priorem Ecclesiæ formam redeat, nos quoque ad illam revertamur, & communionem cum illa in suis porro catibus habeamus: Quod ut tandem fiat, toto animo Domino Jesum precamur, Quid enim pio cuique optatius, quam ut ubi per baptismum renati sumus, ibi etiam in finem usque vivamus? modo in Domino? Ego Hier. Zanchius. Cum tota mea familia testatum hoc volo toti Ecclesiæ Christi in omnem eternitatem.*]

Arg. 5. If Popery do make a new Catholike Church, which was never known for many hundred years after Christ, then is it no safe way to salvation. But Popery doth make a new Catholike Church that was never known of many hundred years after Christ: therefore its no safe way to salvation.

The consequence of the Major will not be denied; for they confess that Christs Church is but one; He had not a Church of one sort for the first ages, and a Church of another sort since: though its accidents may vary, yet so doth not its essence. The Minor I prove thus, That which the Papists make to be the Catholike Church, is only all those Christians that acknowledge the Pope to be the universal Bishop and head of the Catholike Church, having universal supreme jurisdiction, and the Church of Rome to be the Mother and Mistris of all other Churches, and its only a Catholike Church convertible with the *Romane* Church. But such a Catholike Church as this was never known by the Apostles, or of many hundred years after Christ: Therefore Popery maketh a new Catholike Church, which the first ages never knew.

Its true that when Rome being then the ruling City of the world did come to own Christianity, that the Glory of the Empire occasioned the Bishop to be called *Prima sedis Episcopus*, as one that was to take place of the rest of the Patriarchs, who had their several orders or places assigned them (as *Alexandria* to be the second, *Antioch* the third, &c.) which *Bellarmino* confesseth might be after lawfully changed: but as *Alexandria* had not the Government of *Antioch* by that precedence, so neither had Rome any government, of the rest: And as *Constantinople* was afterward set up

Of 20 former precedents. Of Boniface, in an. 329 the Council
 of Nice was held. In 381 was held the Council of Constantinople.
 under St. Basil.

Silvester 4th was 1st Pope above
 in year 314 in his papacy 101st
 and the great became 1st

above *Alexandria* and *Antioch* (and claimed to be above *Rome*) so might it as lawfully have been set up above *Rome*. But what ever be said about their quarrels of precedency, which pride begun and cherished, yet its most evident in all antiquity, that of many hundred years after Christ, there was no such Catholike Church in being, or known, as was centred in the Pope as the head or universal Bishop or Governor, or in *Rome* as the Mistris of the rest. We have long ago challenged them to give us the least proof of such a Church in all antiquity, and they give us nothing, but such forced passages that are nothing to their purpose, that its hard for the most charitable rational man to believe that they do indeed believe themselves, and do not know that they hypocritically endeavor to cheat poor souls by their vain cavils. All the Papiests on earth will never be able to answer what our Divines have said already to prove the novelty of their Papal headship: nor can all the Popes servants in the world bring us one word of currant antiquity for many hundred years after Christ, to prove that ever such a Church was once dreamed of, as they now call the *Romane* Catholike Church. Indeed *Rome* was called then, a Catholike Church, and so was *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and all that held the Catholike faith, and were not heretical: but it was never known till *Boniface* had usurped the Title of universal Bishop above 600. years after Christ (which he procured by *Phocas* a Murderer that usurped the Empire when he had slain the Emperor *Maurisim*) that the *Romane* Church and the Catholike Church was all one, or that it was necessary to make any particular Church or person Catholike, that they acknowledge the universal headship and jurisdiction of the *Romane* Pope, much less his infallibility.

I 3

428 To

13 42310
Boniface was pope in 900 when
Pharamond was K of France.

(Narratives of Emp: read by Phoen in 1870
 and 601 after his reign is years, &
 my reign of Darius is 100 years
 Phoen & Darius
 Emperor
 Turnell
 leaf no.

Phoenix
K
mianan
Emperors

Turn the
leaf over

a challenge

(118)

To heap up Records here would but stop the plain Reader in his course; and somewhat shall be said of it in the next dispute: Onely I now say, that if any one question whether indeed the *Roman* Catholike Church as now constituted be a meer novelty, I here offer my self to the fuller proof of it, and shall desire no better recreation of such a sort then to entertain a dispute about it with any Papists that will undertake their cause.

And here I must needs annex this observation; What a shameless cheat it is by which the Papists do delude the ignorant, perswading them that theirs is the old Religion, and the ancient Church which hath continued from the Apostles without interruption; and that we are men of a new Religion, and of a Church that had never a visible being till the dayes of *Luther*. *Costerus* the Jesuite in the Preface to his *Enchiridion* instructeth his deluded novices how to deal with the Protestants by urging them with three Questions (which we shall resolve anon to his shame) and the last of them is a challenge to us [To name one man before *Luther* that agreed with us in all things] But we challenge, and most confidently challenge all the Papists on earth to name one man for three hundred years after Christ (I might say six hundred years) that agreed with them (not in all things but) in their very Articles of Faith, yea in their Church fundamentals, yea in the very definition of the Catholike Church: We challenge them to name us one man and (prove it) that ever knew or owned such a Church as Catholike that is now so called and owned by them. We confidently affirm (and challenge all the Papists in the world to dispute the point with us) that their Church as Po-

note that in *Cistoire y. Jean* reignish
Boniface y. 2. 3. & fourth were
Popes & that

Mr Baxter is wrong in one part but not in the Conclusion

pish, is a new thing, unknown to our forefathers of the first ages; that Popery is a sardel of new doctrines, unknown to the first Churches. We admire at the immodesty of these men to aske us where our Church was before *Luther*, and to call it a new Religion which we profess, and to ask us whether we think our selves wiser then all the world was heretofore in the purest times? We do most confidently return on them their own demands? We would know from any of them where their Church was for three hundred (yea for six hundred) years after Christs birth? And we wonder how they can think to be saved in a way that was not known for so long time? Do they think themselves wiser then Christs and his Apostles, and all the Christian world for so many hundred years. Again we challenge them to shew us the least proof that ever there was such a thing for so long time, as a Catholike Church convertible with the *Romane*, and headed by the Pope as the universal Bishop having a universal jurisdiction over the rest, or an infallible Judgement in determining of controversies in matters of faith. It is none of the least of our Reasons why we dare not be of the *Romish* faction or opinions, called by them their Church and their Religion, because it is so new, and we dare not venture our souls upon new wayes, nor dare we believe that Christ hath two sorts of Churches essentially different since his Resurrection; one sort before the Popes universal headship, and the other since: nor dare we once imagine that Christ had no true Church on earth till Pope *Boniface* would needs be the universal Bishop, or till *Rome* was advanced to the dignity and titles which it doth now usurpe. I desire no better issue then this

*Procius was chosen Emper^r of
by y^e army & he killed Maximian*

of our difference : Let any Papists living bring out their cause to the tryal of antiquity, and let them that are of the most Ancient Church and Religion, carry the cause. If we prove not theirs new and ours the most ancient, or if they prove theirs more Ancient then ours (as since Christs Resurrection) then we are contented to be of their Church and way.

Arg. 6. If the Papists be the greatest Schismaticks upon earth, most desperately rending the Church and separating themselves from the maine body of the visible Church, then Popery is not a safe way to salvation. But the Papists are the greatest Schismaticks on earth, most desperately rending the Church, and separating themselves from the main body thereof : Therefore Popery is no safe way to salvation.

The consequences of the Major will be confessed by themselves. It is only the Minor, therefore that is to be proved : which is too easily done, being a matter of fact.

First, The Papists do actually rend themselves from the greatest part of Christs Church on earth, condemning all others to everlasting fire : 2. They do lay the grounds of a continual schisme, in making a new center of the unity of the Church : of these two in order.

1. He that shall consider of all the Christians in the world at this day, who subject not themselves to the Pope of Rome, and may truly be reputed to be of the Catholike Church, will see that the Papists are but a small part of the Church : But especially if we consider them as they were not many ages ago, much more numerous then now they be. The *Grecians*, the *Syrians* called *Melchites*, the *Moscovites* and

Rus-

Russians, the *Georgians*, all of the *Greek* Religion besides the multitude of the same Religion dispersed throughout the *Turkes* dominions; also the *Abassins*, *Egyptians*, *Armenians*, *Jacobites*, who are neerer of a mind, and differ from the *Papists*, and submit not to their authority: Besides all the Reformed Churches in *Germany*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Hungary*, *Transylvania*, *Brittain*, *Ireland*, *France*, *Belgia*, *Helvetia*, and other parts with those in the *Indies*; I say consider of all these Christians together and it will appear that the *Papists* are but a few to them, or not neerer so many as they. But if you further consider of the state of the Christian world not many ages ago, when the *Turkes* had not yet subdued the Eastern parts, and when the *Abassian* Empire was much more large, and *Nubia* and other Countries had not revolted, it will appear that we may well say that it was but a small part of Christians comparatively that did acknowledge the universall headship and jurisdiction of the Pope, or submit themselves to him: besides many other points of Religion in which they differ from him. I know that the *Papists* say, that these are all either Hereticks or Schismatics, and so no part of the Catholike Church. But the accusation of Schisme is the meer voice of Schisme, and for Heresie, its true that all men and Churches have their errors, which yet deserve not the name of Heresie: The *Jacobites* and the rest that are neerer them, are afraid of acknowledging two Natures in Christ, lest it lead them to make two persons with the Nestorians; but yet they are not plaine Eutichites: and both they and the Nestorians acknowledge Christ to be perfect God and perfect man; only the Nestorians do amiss name